**Canadian Issues**

Volume 2, Number 1.

A Publication of
The Association for Canadian Studies
L'Association des Etudes Canadiennes

# What Did Symons Say? A Retrospective Look at the Commission on Canadian Studies

# Canadian Issues

Volume 2, Number 1.

A Publication of
The Association for Canadian Studies
L'Association des Etudes Canadiennes

# What Did Symons Say? A Retrospective Look at the Commission on Canadian Studies

# Contents

**Introduction** 5
James Page
Paul M. Koroscil
Stanley E. McMullin

**The Rational for Canadian Studies**

Tom McMillan, *Senior Research Associate, The Symons' Commission* 9
James Steele, *Department of English, Carleton University* 13

**Archives, Libraries and Canadian Studies**

Delores Donnelly, *Faculty of Library Science, University of Toronto* 19
Marcel Caya, *National Archives* 25
George Brandak, *Archivist, University of British Columbia* 29

**Audio-Visual and Museum Resources and Canadian Studies**

William Young, *Head: Institutional Relations, C.R.T.C.* 35
Sandy Bernett, *National Film Board* 39
Frank Corcoran, *National Museum of Man* 43

**A Canadian Context for Business Studies**

Stanley Shapiro, *Dean of Business, McGill University* 47
Roger Hall, *Department of History, University of Western Ontario* 53

**Teacher Education: The Schools and Canadian Studies**

George Tompkins, *Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia* 61
Paul Gallaghar, *Past Director, Canada Studies Foundation* 67
Paul Robinson, *Atlantic Institute of Education* 71

**The Universities and The Symons'** ***Report***

R.J. Baker, *Former President, University of P.E.I.* 83
Lucien Michaud, *Recter, University of Sudbury* 85
Jeffrey Holmes, *formerly with the Atlantic Association of Universities* 89

**Canadian Studies and Science and Technology**

Glen Palmer, *Department of Physics, U.P.E.I.* 93
Andrew Wells, U.P.E.I. 99

**Discipline by Discipline Reviews of The Symons' Report**

Linguistics: *R.J. Baker, U.P.E.I.* 105
History: *Colin Howell, Department of History, St. Mary's University* 107
Sociology: *Wallace Clement, Department of Sociology, McMaster* 109
Literature: *Robert Sorfleet, Department of English, Concordia* 111
Political Economy/Political Science: *Mel Watkins,*
*Department of Political Economy, University of Toronto* 113
Geography: *J. Lewis Robinson, Department of Geography, U.B.C.* 115
Geography: Paul M. Koroscil, Department of Geography, Simon Fraser 117
International Affairs,
University of Toronto 121
French Canadian Studies: *Pierre Savard, Directeur, du centre de*
*récherche en civilization canadienne français, University of Ottawa* 123
Psychology: *Wallace Lambert, Department of Psychology, McGill* 125

### Canadian Issues

*Canadian Issues* is a publication of the Association for Canadian Studies/L'Association des Etudes Canadiennes. Designed as a bi-annual publication, *Canadian Issues* features papers and proceedings from the Association's national conferences, and theme issues which address various concerns of importance to the Canadian studies movement.

### Editorial Board

This issue has been edited by:

Paul M. Koroscil
*Department of Geography*
*Simon Fraser University*

Stanley E. McMullin
*Canadian Studies,*
*University of Waterloo*

James E. Page
*Liberal Studies Division,*
*Seneca College*

ISSN 0318-8442

*Canadian Issues* is available free to members of The Association for Canadian Studies/L'Association des Etudes Canadiennes. Subscriptions for non-members are also available at the annual subscription rate of $10.00 per year.

To become a member of ACS/AEC, or to subscribe to this journal, write to:
*Canadian Issues*, The Association for Canadian Studies, 1750 Finch Avenue East, Willowdale, Ontario, M2J 2X5.

In addition to receiving *Canadian Issues*, members of ACS/AEC receive our quarterly *Newsletter* which features news and notes of interest to Canadianists. Members are entitled, as well, to reduced registration rates at ACS/AEC conferences and workshops, and to full voting privileges in the organization. Membership also includes a reduced subscription rate to *The Journal of Canadian Studies*.

### Acknowledgements

ACS/AEC wishes to acknowledge the financial support and encouragement given *Canadian Issues* by the University of Waterloo and Simon Fraser University. Publication of this number has been made possible by a grant from the Bronfman Foundation. The Conference which produced the material in this issue issue was made possible through a grant from the Canada Council. Design and production assistance have been provided by Kathy Jull and the staff of Graphic Services, UW.

# Introduction

In May 1977, The Association for Canadian Studies sponsored a week-long conference at the University of Prince Edward Island, to review the findings and the recommendations of the *Report* of the Commission on Canadian Studies. This *Report*, entitled *To Know Ourselves*, was prepared by Professor T.H.B. Symons for the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. It has become a landmark document for those interested in furthering the development of Canadian studies at the school, college and university levels.

In the following pages, The Association for Canadian Studies offers some of the papers which were presented at what we styled "The Second Charlottetown Conference". Those selected for publication provide a cross section of the first-class discussion of the issues which occurred. The absence of a particular paper does not reflect on the contribution to the debate made by an individual. Rather, those published were chosen because they represent the diverse points of view presented at the conference. Further, we were limited by the space available to us, the variable quality of the recording and the transcription of sessions, and the availability of prepared statements.

Because most of this volume appears from transcripts, the editors accept responsibility for any ideosyncracies of syntax or style. We have tried to edit these tapes as consistently as possible, without detracting from the speakers' eloquence. In some cases, we think that we have succeeded; in others we may have failed. We apologize to those whose work we may have tarnished with our efforts.

What emerges in this volume is an insightful and concerned discussion of the issues. Most of them are still with us; consequently, this is a timely publication. The Symons' *Report* has had an extensive impact on academic circles, but there is still much to be done to address the problems identified by Dr. Symons and his colleagues. Our hope is that this issue of our journal will help to keep the discussion alive.

In addition, of course, we think that *Canadian Issues*, by publishing these papers at this time, will help to whet peoples' appetite for the next two volumes of the Symons' *Report*. These volumes are nearing completion and should appear soon.

*Paul Koroscil*
*Stanley McMullin*
*James Page*

# The Rationale for Canadian Studies

Tom McMillan
James Steele

The following two excerpts from the discussion of the Symons' *Report's* rationale for Canadian Studies are indicators, we think, of the vitality of the debate about what constitutes Canadian studies. These comments will be especially valuable for those new to the field.

# Tom McMillan

The Commission on Canadian Studies was established in response to the widely held view that students were graduating from our educational institutions without an adequate knowledge of the culture, history, government, geography, science and social dynamics of Canada. When the Commission began its work, a large number of people thought that it should begin by ceremonially burning the American flag on the steps of the Parliament Buildings. Others, with equal force, discounted the Commission, in the belief that Canadian studies was a fanciful misconception which ignored the fact that education, knowledge and research are universal in character. They argued that these endeavours cannot be confined to national borders, to a culture, to a particular society. For this reason, these people thought that most of the matters which the Commission has been asked to investigate could safely be ignored. Well, ladies and gentlemen, as you well know from the size of the report, which has been forbidding to some people, the Commission could not accept that assumption.

The Commission believed that it had a real role to play in determining whether or not Canadians were, in fact, graduating from their educational institutions, ignorant of their own country and society. The Commission was not interested in mere nose counting or blood testing; we were looking for what might best be called an awareness factor, a sensitivity to Canadian conditions. We were not looking at the quantity of Canadian content in school, community college and university curricula; rather, we were looking for the quality of attention given to Canadian matters. The Symons' Commission didn't assume that Canadian studies were valuable because they could be marshalled as an exercise in nationalism, or because it could serve to protect Canadian sovereignty from some threat, either internal or external. We did not see Canadian studies as some device to bring about national unity, or as some method for propagandizing for the status quo, as some people have assumed and argued. The basic assumption of the Commission and of the *Report* is the value and the importance of self-knowledge, the need for Canadians to know and to understand themselves.

Based on the need for self-knowledge, as a classical theme in Western thought, the *Report* provides a rationale for Canadian studies. But there is a further rationale for Canadian studies that is evident in this *Report,* and that rationale is a pragmatic one.

The fact is that the university draws much of its strength from its community. It grows out of its community and, for this reason, it owed a measure of service to that community. Universities have become extremely important institutions in complex societies. This is true in terms of the cost of the university to the nation, but it is truest in terms of the impact of the university on the community. In Canada, our post-secondary educational institutions are one of this country's greatest national resources. Unless that resource is marshalled in the service of society, those universities will not only be perceived as irrelevant, but they will, in fact, be irrelevant. In Canada, for example, in the last fiscal year over two and one-half billion dollars were spent on universities by public and private sources. That is a very substantial investment and Canadians expect a fair return on that investment. They expect it not only in academic terms, but also in pragmatic terms. And this is where Canadian studies comes in.

As you will know from reading the Symons' *Report,* Canadian universities have an unparalleled record of neglect of the nation's needs. Our universities have been slower to recognize their responsibility to help society grapple with its problems than universities in most other countries. Each country, because of its geography, its culture, its climate, its economic environment and its place in the community of nations, has special needs. While I am the first to admit that knowledge is universal, that it is international and cannot be confined to a specific society, it is important to recognize that the application of knowledge is culturally specific.

Too often Canadian scholars and researchers have been slow to recognize that Canada faces enormous problems. We cannot address those problems. Consequently, the university has a special role to play in bringing its resources to bear on Canadian issues and concerns. Only when that is done, will we, as a community, be able to grapple with the tough decisions which must be made. It was embarrassingly clear to the Commission on Canadian Studies that our university communities have been slow to recognize this and to shoulder their responsibility to Canadian society. It is only with a high level of self-knowledge that we can make informed decisions about our country and be able to address the problems that it faces.

There is a further implication of this lack of attention to Canadian problems and prospects. This implication relates to the international community and our responsibility to it. People outside of Canada expect that a sophisticated technological society such as ours should be able to provide answers to specific Canadian questions. Often, the knowledge that a particular society has about its own problems can help other societies grapple with theirs. Many of the problems which 23 face have parallels in other countries; therefore, if we act wisely, people in other nations can learn much from how we address our particular problems. By knowing ourselves, then, we can contribute not only to our own well-being, but also to the well-being of others.

For example, we are a country with a parliamentary governmental system. It is not quite the same as that of Britain or the United States. The knowledge that we have about our sytem can help others to evaluate and to understand their own institutions, or to develop new ones. Similarly, our federal system, fraught with problems and tensions, is in many senses a unique one. The more that is known about it, the more will be known about the operation of federal systems everywhere. We can examine our political parties, our problems of regional disparity, our relationship to the United States, the way in which we are coping, or failing to cope with multinational corporations and, in doing so, contribute to the fund of international knowledge about these phenomena. Seen in this light, Canadian studies is not a narrowly focussed exercise; rather, it is a broad contribution to our own self-knowledge and to the fund of international scholarship and research. If we do not come to know ourselves, who will?

To conclude, it is important to note that, as the Commission on Canadian Studies travelled the country to listen to people express themselves, one point was made over and over again. It was that, as soon as a researcher or scholar gets involved in teaching or research that involves our specific culture, the value of the work done is suspect. We were struck by the number of times that the people who said these things were often the first to speak up in favour of doing research or teaching about American literature, or the geography of the Sahara, or doing research on the aborigines of New Guinea. But, as soon as it was said that, as Canadians, we should have some concern for the problems of Canada, they changed their tune. There was something in their bias, their beliefs, or their prejudice that caused them to conclude that, if something was Canadian or related to our society, it was by definition second rate. This completely ignores the fact that outside of Canada the value of area studies is hardly questioned at all. Universities around the globe are devoting a great deal of attention to the problems that their respective societies face, either through formally designated programmes of research and teaching, or simply through the fact of a pervasive concern about the country in the university community. This sort of focus is taken for granted outside of Canada, but, for reasons identified in the *Report,* it has been ignored here.

# James Steele

My fellow panelists have commented on certain aspects of the rationale for Canadian studies in the Symons' *Report*. They have spoken as members of the Commission and I, for my part, have been asked to comment on this *Report* as an observer. My only contact with the Commission was appearing before it at one of its hearings.

Before I spell out my criticisms, however, I would like to stress that, for the most part, they have to do with what was left unsaid in the *Report*, rather than what was said. It cannot be denied, and it must be clearly affirmed, that the Symons' *Report* is probably the most important study of Canadian education yet to have been written. It is certainly the most comprehensive account of the denatured condition of Canadian culture in the universities. The relative richness of its texture becomes apparent, when it is compared to earlier writings on this theme, such as J.D. Logan's ineffectual plea to the Board of Governors of Dalhousie University. In the early years of this century, Logan requested that the teaching of Canadian literature be included in the curriculum of that university, a request which was not granted. One thinks of Samuel Moffat's continentalist argument in the *Americanization of Canada*. You will remember that he told us about the fur trade, about the timber trade, about pirates, about publishing, but not much about the curricula of the schools or universities. One thinks of the Massey report in the 50's, which suggested a palliative that eventually took the form of the Canada Council, but this report offered virtually no rationale for the study of this country. One also thinks of George Grant's ironic lament in the 1960's. Grant linked the notion of nationality and the national right to self-knowledge to a kind of devine order which was hostile to technology and self-serving nationality. Moreover, one thinks of the B and B report which, volume after volume, evaded the question of Canada's national culture, even while reducing them to merely linguistic phenomena.

Compared to these works, the Symons' *Report* is very rich; indeed, it is something of a monument. A comparison of the Symons' *Report* to these earlier studies serves to remind us that the *Report* is an expression of a long debate in this country about the meaning of national rights, in the context of, first, one empire and, then, another, and in the context of Confederation itself.

This is neither the time nor the place to trace the development of this debate, but I should like to make one observation. In this country, since about the time of the First World War, a certain cosmopolitanism has characterized those gentlemen who are both very rich and very powerful. By cosmopolitanism, I mean that attitude which tends to deny the national rights of peoples, including the right to self-knowledge. While affirming the universal identity of individuals, cosmopolitanism is really quite opposed to and radically different from internationalism.

The first great Canadian apostle of cosmopolitanism, William Lyon Mackenzie King, saw the social utility of this doctrine. He argued for its acceptance in *Industry and Humanity,* this being his euphemistic title for the trans-national corporation, employing white labour in economically advanced western countries. Because this doctrine was quite consistent with the interests of trans-national corporations, which were well established in this country by then, it was readily accepted. The doctrine's acceptance was also helped by Canada becoming a net exporter of capital in 1920, with large amounts of capital going to what are now called Third World countries.

Stripped of its racial overtones, cosmopolitanism soon became the conventional wisdom of the academics, with articulate and original advocates in almost every discipline. Here, one thinks of Seely MacPherson and the field of political economy, Trudeau with his liberal functionalism in the field of political philosophy, Northrop Frye and A. James Smith in the fields of literary criticism, Marshall McLuhan in communications, and so on.

Cosmopolitanism is a theory which was willingly accepted shortly after the First World War. The public had experienced an unpleasant, first-hand knowledge of the link between national chauvinism and war. After the Second World War, anti-nationalist and anti-internationalist cosmopolitanism found further sustenance in continental integration, both economic and military, which took place between Canada and the United States and in the anti-communism of the cold war.

The continuing concern in Canada for national rights, including the right to self-knowledge, whether it be a particular knowledge or a quest of some kind, is a clear indication of the deep human importance of the issue at hand. The remarkable thing about the Symons' *Report* is that this concern, which for many years was articulated by only a few pariahs of the Canadian intelligentsia, including Grant and Innis, is expressed by a scholar who seems to have acquired some solid support within the Canadian academic community. Its author also enjoys the sponsorship of the AUCC and the financial support of the Canada Council. And it is worth noting that the *Report* has been enthusiastically received in many quarters of this country. In light of the *Report's* reasonable, humane and enlightened recommendations, a number of post-secondary institutions have been carrying out reviews of their curricula.

All of this is indicative of a most important change in attitude. When one considers that the AUCC delayed the appointment of a commissioner to carry out this study for some three and one-half years, the degree of change becomes evident. However, in the words of one former member of the AUCC, even then it was done with the hope that it would defuse an explosive problem. But I am glad to say the report has not defused an explosive problem; it has added to it. There are so many sticks of dynamite and so many fuses that there is not any way that the problems, which the *Report* described, can be buried. One trusts, of course, that the AUCC will publish the third and fourth volumes when they are ready to go to press.

Since the substance and the recommendations of the *Report* are well known, I shall limit my further comments to a couple of observations about some of the undeclared assumptions underlying its argument. While the *Report* purports to be non-political, non-ideological, non-partisan, particularly with respect to the national question, it nevertheless reveals certain biases and predispositions. These in no way undermine the validity of most of the recommendations, but they do have a bearing on some.

Specifically, the *Report* is clearly a federalist document. It liberally acknowledges that a discussion of the right of the Quebeçois to national self-determination is an aspect of the Canadian reality. Nevertheless, it refers repeatedly to one national identity, based on *"those qualities, ideals, experiences and institutions that we have in common as Canadians, a single identity, although made up of numberless components about any one of which one may legitimately agree"*. The Commission's apparent lack of awareness of the potential right of the Quebeçois to a national identity of similar breadth and depth must be regarded as one of the limitations of this *Report*.

Even while insisting on the importance of the historical dimension to the study of the Canadian reality, the *Report* is basically ahistorical in its own mode of analysis, to the extent that it is a descriptive inventory of a contemporary state of affairs. This limitation may be appropriate, but, insofar as the *Report* offers no explanation for the lack of Canadian self-knowledge, this limitation has the effect of narrowing the basis of explanation to the personal attitudes, either ethical, moral or intellectual, of individuals, particularly university teachers.

We are told, for instance, that Canadian studies has been neglected, sometimes merely for want of a clearly formulated rationale which would justify the inclusion of Canadian material in the curriculum. We are also told that Canadian studies has been neglected merely because of the hostility, the intellectual dependency, the indifference or the misunderstanding of individual scholars. While these factors may be present, and we can all think of individuals who are suffering from these feelings, I think that this kind of comment has relatively little explanatory value. Of much greater significance are some of the social conditions which have been deliberately developed and fostered by Canadian governments, both federal and provincial, contexts which are and have been inimical to the right of Canadians to acquire self-knowledge and to develop their national cultures.

How could Canadian studies develop and flourish when the economy was being alienated and placed in the hands of foreign corporations? As Mel Watkins has remarked, a branch plant economy really requires branch plant minds. How could Canadian studies develop when province after province has agreed, almost as if they were in conspiracy, to Americanize elementary and secondary school curricula, in both content and form? How could Canadian studies flourish when Canadian citizens must live in a world of mindless commodity, fetishism and personalism which are, at best, indifferent to any kind of community value? How could Canadian studies develop, when the federal government was unwilling to take the most elementary steps to encourage the training and employment of Canadians in universities, and to correlate such plans for the development of Canadian human resources with the employment of scholars from abroad?

These are the large policy decisions that were taken in this country and, compared to these large social policies, the attitudes of individual scholars within the universities are relatively insignificant. The Symons' *Report* does not address these questions at all. For political reasons, I can understand why it does not. Perhaps it is just as well that it didn't, because it is very important that the *Report* be as widely accepted as possible. But that is a major shortcoming of the *Report*, and that is really the substance of my remarks.

# Archives, Libraries and Canadian Studies

Delores Donnelly
Marcel Caya
George Brandack

# Delores Donnelly

Since the first two volumes of the Symons' *Report* did not deal with libraries or the education of librarians, I am not able to relate my discussion to the Symons' *Report* in that sense. The next two volumes will certainly have a chapter or chapters on resources in libraries to support Canadian studies because we have been collecting data and know it is forthcoming.

By some paradoxical oversight, chapter five of the *Report*, which examines the Canadian component in education for the professions, does not include, in its supposedly typical group of professions, the profession of library science. It starts alphabetically with architecture and ends with zoology. It includes forestry and physical education, but appears to miss the logic of the assumption that the role of education for librarianship or library science is basic to the understanding of and responsibility for the provision of the knowledge base for the teaching of the other professions. I am grateful to the Conference organizers for asking me to participate in this panel and for the suggestion that I speak about the role of Faculties of Library Science in preparing people to deal effectively with Canadian materials. It was suggested that I might speak about the University of Toronto's response to this problem but much of what I have to say will apply to the other Faculties of Library Science as well.

Since I operate on the basis of always trying to establish an historical context, I should say at the beginning that there are at present, seven accredited Canadian Library Schools or Faculties. The oldest of these are McGill and Toronto founded in 1927 and 1928 respectively. At that time, they gave only the BLS degree. These two schools dominated the field of library education until the beginning of the 1960's. The French language school at the Université de Montréal, though of an earlier origin, did not become accredited until the '60's. In 1961, the School of Librarianship was founded at the University of British Columbia, to be followed a few years later by the School of Librarian Information Science at The University of Western Ontario, the School of Library Service at Dalhousie, and a new school at The University of Alberta.

All the schools started with the Bachelor of Library Science degree programme but in 1968, six of the existing library schools agreed to phase out their BLS programme and implement the basic Masters programme with a two-year equivalent instead. The University of Alberta programme, which had just recently been established, opted out of this at the time. It has now also discontinued its BLS and is now working on the same Masters Degree programme.

In addition to the graduate programmes in Library Science, there are in Canada twenty-four Library Technician training programmes in community colleges across the country; ten in Quebec, nine in Ontario, one in Manitoba, one in Saskatchewan, two in Alberta and one in British Columbia. These programmes accept students with Grade Twelve who, after completion of their two-year requirements, receive Library Technicians Diplomas enabling them to perform meaningful and sometimes very responsible positions in Canadian libraries.

Finally, most Faculties of Education in Canada offer courses for school librarians, including a component in children's and young people's literature.

All of the Canadian graduate schools recognize what is known as the "core concept", according to which it is agreed that there is a basic body of subject matter intrinsic to the pursuit of librarianship, regardless of in what country the programme is being studied. This is usually the component of the first-year programme. However, in Toronto for example, core courses endeavour to have a significant component of Canadian content in specific units which lend themselves to study in the context of the Canadian environment. Such courses would be similar to a course that is given everywhere, called "The Library in Society". At Toronto, we call it "A Social Environment in Libraries". Information resources in library collections would certainly pertain to the Canadian environment, and less pertinently, some of the others where the reseach requirements can simply be done in a Canadian field. At Toronto, eight of the sixty-seven electives, offered in the second year programme are specifically Canadian content courses. For example, we have such courses as "Research Collections from Canadiana", "Literature of the Canadian Humanities", Canadian Resources and the Social Sciences", "Canadian Government Publications", "Contemporary Publishing" and "Libraries and Librarianship in Canada", and so on. At least, I would say, another nineteen or twenty of our courses have a significant Canadian component; that is to say, they would apply universal or theoretical principles to Canadian problem solving. Something that is also common to most of the Library Schools is a number of interdisciplinary courses usually conducted by specialists in the field. Such courses would be "Historical Manuscripts and Archival Collections", "Legal Literature and Librarianship", and so on. Every school has something on archives.

Two of the principle factors pertaining to course offerings in Library Science as in any other discipline or profession, are, faculty availability and the availability or existence of relevant published and unpublished literature relating to the subject field. Only in recent years has the knowledge base of Library Science begun to expand, and there is still a dearth of Canadian material needed for the documentation and teaching of Canadian Library Science. A perfectly appalling example of this is the almost total lack of scholarly research studies in Canadian library history. Few of the leading library institutions in Canada can boast research accounts of their origins. The theory is that the documentation may not even be available when the library historians get around to the task.

In the first two decades of Canadian library education the quality of degree programmes rested on the acknowledged expertise and scholarship of a handful of library educators. None of these people had the PhD degree. As momentum mounted for graduate programmes in university-based schools, the race for qualified faculty started. Many of these were recruited from outside Canada, while Canadians themselves, who wished to stay in the teaching profession, went off to the American universities to secure PhD degrees and return to Canada to resume teaching posts. Very few significant Canadian library studies were carried out in the pursuit of Doctorates in American schools. There has been an obvious lack of Canadian research on problems peculiar to Canadian librarianship, and a consequent dependence upon less appropriate research and publications from the United States and Great Britian. Because of the acknowledged need for faculty with Canadian experience at the Doctoral level, and the encouragement of Canadian-oriented research, two Canadian PhD programmes were originated in 1971, one at Toronto and one at The University of Western Ontario. Each school was assigned its own areas of specialization based upon faculty strengths. So far, Toronto has graduated one student and has seven others enrolled, with five at the advanced stage of thesis, three of whom already teach on Canadian campuses. The School of Librarian Information at Western has eight students currently enrolled. Both schools stress theoretical research and focus upon Canadian issues. Apropos of the manpower situation, one can hardly foresee a surplus of Canadian PhDs in Library Science in the years ahead, in so far as teaching is concerned.

In recent years, perhaps because of the stimulus provided by the interest of faculty and others in the Doctoral programme, there has been a significant growth in faculty research and publications. For example, an internal report which I prepared for the Faculty of Library Science for the University of Toronto's Task Force on Canadian Studies, which was struck in response to the Symons Commission *Report*, listed nine major monographs based on Canadian library studies which have been published by individual faculties since 1972. Now this is admittedly a long shot from the goal of supplying Canadian support material for Library Science studies, but it does show a significant growth, and I can say Toronto is not alone on the march. Almost every Library School in Canada can point to research published by its faculty. Perhaps the Canadian content is higher at Toronto because we have a larger number of Canadians on faculty.

At the Centre for Research in Librarianship, founded as a component of the Faculty of Library Science in 1975, there may be a promising factor in generating research for librarianship in Canada. It is the first such Centre in Canada, although they are very common in the United States. Among its stated objectives is a provision of research facilities and expertise for library educators, graduate students and practicing librarians. Funded research to date includes a research design for a nation-wide Canadian public library inquiry. The project calls for team research involving researchers from several other Canadian library schools who will participate, as well as other interdisciplinary faculty from elsewhere.

A preparation of a Canadian catalogue of books and periodicals for public libraries, which is scheduled for publication in the fall of 1977, is also in the works.

Turning to another concern, faculties in almost every university in the country today are painfully aware of the expectations of their graduates and of specific communities, regarding the provision of continuing education for the updating of essential information and expertise. Librarianship is no exception. Across Canada, in response to local needs, each of the schools has inaugurated its own programmes of seminars and workshops, short courses, summer sessions and colloquia. While identified needs go far beyond the boundaries of Canadian-oriented interests *per se*, emphasis on Canadian materials has been assuming increasing importance in the working environment of Canadian libraries. Even before the Symons' Commission brought down its *Report*, studies were under way to investigate and assess the availability of Canadian materials in libraries, and the degree of awareness of current publications on the part of those responsible for library acquisitons. For example, on the juvenile scene, Professor John Warkentin carried out a national survey of juvenile fiction publications and the library market. This survey was published by the Canadian Library Association in 1975. Among other findings, it revealed that library personnel are all too frequently hampered in their book selection policies by a lack of knowledge of publishing and authorship in Canada, and that the gap is much wider and more destructive in elementary school libraries than in children's departments of public libraries. Along these same lines the highly relevant case study of Canadian books in Canadian schools completed for the City of Toronto board of education presented a dismal picture of the Canadian textbook situation. I quote from that study: *"while school libraries could play a major role in supplementing inadequate classroom textbook material, at present, they are not doing so"*.

On a positive note, there is the interesting experimental group on Canadian materials at the Toronto Public Library, established recently in response to Board and public pressure, which is now developing proposals for acquiring, processing and publicizing Canadian materials throughout the library system. The attractive booklist, entitled *Experience Canada*, was prepared by a group of young librarians, most of them recent graduates from our own Faculty. It provides an interdisciplinary selection of 250 titles, out of the possible 10,000 Canadian publications now available in both French and English.

The growing insistance on awareness of Canadian materials has been a persuasive factor in two highly successful three-day workshops, sponsored by the University of Toronto School of Continuing Studies, in co-operation with the Faculty of Library Science. I was involved in both of them. One in 1975 followed the theme, *"Canadian Studies '75: the Implications for Libraries"*, and another in 1976 was entitled *"Letters in Canada, An Approach to Contemporary Collections for Canadian Libraries"*. This workshop was scheduled to correspond with the publication of the Symons' *Report* and had as its key-note speaker, Dr. Tom Symons. I would say that the librarians in the Toronto area were probably the first ones to hear Dr. Symons speak to his own *Report*. Both of these seminars were interdisciplinary in focus, including not only print media, but also panelists devoted to the consideration of archives and archival material, audio-visual resources and local history. Other continuing studies and seminars have treated Canadian materials for children, Canadian government documents and so on.

If I may draw any conclusions from these hurried observations, I feel reasonably assured that there is not only an awareness of but also an insistence on Canadian content in the library schools in Canada. The first thing to note here is that the students themselves are insisting on Canadian content. They give us course evaluations every year, and they also have representatives in every single course committee. In no uncertain way, in briefs and informal representations, they have made it very definite that they expect to have Canadian readings and Canadian references, and the Canadian context for any of the course work that we are presenting. Where it is practical, we orient course work to a Canadian context or supply Canadian readings; however, it is not always possible to do this, because materials are not always available.

Secondly, there is an awakening to the realization that we need a more specifically Canadian knowledge base, and that the only way to get this is by initiating our own research. Thirdly, there are indications everywhere that Faculties of Library Science across the country are ready to explore alternatives, involving interdisciplinary studies, cross appointments and joint degrees, all with a view to make our contribution more relevant and more real. We already have examples of the joint degree programme in Education and Librarianship for school librarians at The University of British Columbia. We have one in the works at Dalhousie on Management Studies and Librarianship. I would hope that we may yet hear some discussion at this Conference about the possibility of joint programmes or some kind of inter-relationship in the preparation of archivists, a topic to which the Symons' *Report* addresses itself explicitly.

# Marcel Caya

Traditionally, archives have been considered an important element in Canadian studies. It seemed only logical that the main resource for the writing of the national history receive this kind of recognition. Indeed, the archives' function of collecting original historical documentation has almost exclusively conferred upon them the role of guardians of an important component of our society's heritage.

That a study primarily concerned with university teaching has devoted a full chapter on archives should not surprise anyone within or without the university community. What is surprising, however, is that the definition of archives used in the Symons' *Report* encompasses more than the traditional role assigned to archival respositories. We may find very few institutions ready to respond to Symons' challenge.

In calling for universities to play a leading role in the formation of a network of regional archives, archival repositories and in the education of archivists, the *Report* has drawn the attention of university administrators to the need for the development of a sound archival organization in Canada. It has given substance and concrete goals for the development in Canada of a more adequate definition of archives. For too long, archival repositories have been considered as some type of rare bookroom or warehouse for papers of distinguished individuals, maintained for the sole purpose of providing a resource centre for the writing of the national history. Traditionally, each repository worked in isolation, to ensure the acquisition of the most popular collections, using a logic more fitted to the public relations department of an institution than the actual needs for the preservation of information created by a given community.

Archives are more than repositories which collect historical documentation. Archives are primarily an original process by which information of permanent value from a community is preserved, maintained and made available, not only to the community which created it, but also to society in general. Archivists do not solely concern themselves with information on paper. They are concerned with all types of communication media, including photographs, recording tape and machine-readable film. The archivist is truly a judge of what contemporary information should be kept and what information can safely be destroyed.

By outlining the need for better record management practices by university administrations, the *Report* has hit a sore point. Few Canadian universities have yet developed formal record management programmes. In fact, of the twenty-seven universities surveyed by Ian Wilson, only seven had created such programmes.

Because university communities are not only creators of archives, but also are very important users, they are in a very good position to provide leadership in the development of the archival resources of their region. In most provinces of Canada, everything is expected to be sent to the Capital for appraisal and safe-keeping. Local archives could preserve more detailed documentation than would be the case if provincial or national selection criteria are applied. The university should provide certain archival services to the community which supports it. It matters little if regional archives are created and sponsored by the universities or if they co-operate with provincial jurisdictions. The aim should always remain the preservation within a given community of the information of permanent value which is required to ensure its full cultural, political, social and legal development. It should strive to establish communication among institutions, professionals and users.

In all cases universities should co-operate with provincial governments to define their role in each given region in order to bring about the more logical understanding and rationalization of the expenditure of public monies on archives. Only then can they play a leading and useful role.

Another facet of the role which universities could play to improve the fortune of archives in this country relates more closely to their primary function in the formation of competent archivists. Presently, despite repeated efforts by archivist associations and, sometimes, library associations, no formal graduate courses on archives exist in Canada. It would seem logical that a number of universities offer adequate training to those who wish to become professional archivists. The development of such programmes should be undertaken in co-operation with existing archival organizations to ensure that the curricula meets all the needs for producing good archivists.

On a more positive note, there have been a number of encouraging developments which have taken place since the writing of the Commission's chapter on archives. In 1975, a new Association of Canadian Archivists was founded on the basis provided by the Archives Section of the Canadian Historical Association. While the new association is not yet taking concrete steps to implement any of the specific recommendations of the *Report*, its principal goal of promoting public awareness of archival material falls well within the spirit of the first recommendation of that chapter of the *Report*.

The *Report* itself is performing part of the task of promoting an awareness of the value of records. A number of committees set up to study its recommendations have given attention to archives. The To Know Ourselves Committee of the Ontario Arts Council, for example, has decided to work with the co-operation of existing associations to develop an archival policy for itself, as well as for its clients. It is also encouraging the training of art archivists in community colleges.

More concretely, the Commission's recommendation on the permanent establishment of the National Film Archives was fully implemented when the federal treasury board granted both monetary and manpower resources. The National Film Board will now be able to make the National Film Archives its repository for production resources and its products.

In the final analysis, although some of the recommendations of the *Report* are being implemented, it would be unfair if the sole implementation of a number of recommendations was to be considered the ultimate goal of the exercise. It would be too bad, if this were the case, because the *Report* contains only a limited number of elements for the initiation of a public debate on all facets of Canadian studies. While the *Report* contains useful background material and some answers to problems, it should be viewed as only a beginning. The most useful goal of the *Report* is to stimulate public discussion.

# George Brandack

I would like to concentrate on two recommendations in the *Report's* chapter on Archives. One of these recommendations is concerned with the creation of a national network of regional archives to promote development in a rational manner, and the second deals with the diffusion of archival material. Many of the other recommendations on archives either relate directly to these two recommendations or would be implemented even if these recommendations were not made. Without substantial funding and co-operation by all types of institutions preserving archival material, without the co-operation of university administrations, these two recommendations, with all their ramifications, will die.

At a symposium on the use of Archives at Simon Fraser University, a speaker from the Public Records Office in London, England, suggested that the trend in his country was towards the greater use of regional records and archives of institutions such as political parties, trade unions, protest organizations, and other pressure groups. He stated that importance is not so much placed on the public archives of the central government, as on the non-public archives of important national and local institutions. That statement can also be applied to Canada. Symons has recognized the importance of that statement by suggesting an national network of regional archives.

However, there are inconsistencies among Symons' recommendations. The Commission recommended the establishment of a Canadian Art Archives under the joint auspices of the Public Archives of Canada in a national gallery. Yet art manuscripts are not different from other manuscripts except in subject, and there is a place for them in regional archival institutions throughout the country, provided that proper facilities and staff to care for them exist. Also, Symons recommended the formation of a committee on the development of native archival resources. It has been suggested that various groups interested in native studies, if they were on such a committee, would recommend the dispersal of federal government records. Any attempt to pull so-called native records out of the context in which they were created should be vigorously resisted as it violates the basic archival principles of providence. However, in reading the chapter as a whole, it seems to me that Symons is asking for an end to the artificial creation of collections by subject, such as women's studies, labour studies, ethnic studies, business studies, etc., and requesting the development of a more rational system with records of national significance. If those institutions or organizations have not established their own archives and records of regional and local interest, their documents will be preserved in the areas in which they were created. Of course, there will be exceptions owing to the donor's preferences and the possible unwillingness of various universities which have established ongoing programmes to purchase literary manuscripts and other collections to follow these guidelines, but these basic guidelines have been proposed for a national network. This question is a very controversial one, even among archivists, as was discovered by a select committee of four persons from B.C. appointed by the executive of the Association of Canadian Archivists to prepare a response to the Symons' *Report*. Although questionnaire returns favoured the concept of a regional archives by approximately 2 to 1, there was much concern about the definition of the term "region", about who would administer and control them, and about the availability of proper facilities and trained archivists.

Some archivists felt that if existing types of institutions were properly funded to expand their operations, local and regional records would be well-served. Owing to a variety of comments from different sections of the country, the select committee recognized that different archival patterns have emerged in different provinces and suggested that the various types of archival institutions within each province develop workable systems of regional archives through cooperation and the diffusion of archival materials.

Although the majority of archivists approve of the concept of regional archives, archivists working in all types of institutions were apprehensive about the suitability of universities as regional archives. A university archivist asked how university archives could possibly function at the higher standard of service required for a regional centre, when most university archives have never been given support in staff, money, space, equipment, or legislation, to enable them to function effectively at a minimal archival standard? A number of university archivists stressed the need for model legislation providing for a comprehensive university archival management programme that could be presented by the archivists to the appropriate governing body of the university. If these were effected, university archivists would be better equipped to meet their prime archival responsibilities. Once these were met, then and only then, university archivists could consider broadening their base of operations.

Now the select committee recognized that universities help make significant contributions to preserving the nation's heritage by acquiring archival materials which would otherwise be destroyed or were neglected in the past. However, there is not as great a need today, as there was in the past, for universities to place their priorities on the acquisiton of manuscript collections rather than on the preservation of their administration records and private papers of faculties.

Acquisitions of prestige collections from other provinces and regions is detrimental to the spirit of co-operation and the diffusion of resources that is so necessary. A total archives network will serve community needs and foster a greater preservation of all archival resources.

Co-operation is essential for the development of a workable network of regional archives. Therefore, the select committee suggested that any university contemplating the possibility of undertaking a role in a regional archives network should recruit trained archivists. These archivists should maintain a responsible role in administering manuscript collections as well as university archives. In addition, the chain of communication between university archivists and university administrators should be strengthened so that all archival undertakings are mutually agreed upon. In short, universities should put their own house in order before agreeing to become a regional archives. They must realize the ethical and financial responsibilities associated with such a network.

Hopefully, the universities' burden will be lessened by the adherence of provincial and federal governments to Symons' recommendation that archives be considered an essential element of the universities' academic development as a public institution and adequate funding will be provided, specifically for this most important facet of the universities' work.

Since any university involvement in regional archives must include funds for copying material, a system of provincial grants comparable to a museum's grant structure in many provinces might enable repositories to operate within certain standards. Additional funding should be directed toward provincial archives to assist regional archives by developing a substantial microfilm diffusion programme of provincial records and to maintain good centralized conservation facilities that could assist in training archivists from all regions in basic conservation techniques.

The diffusion programme of the Public Archives of Canada should be continued and expanded to include other archival institutions in addition to provincial archives, rather than be cut back to a minimum, which it is at the moment, because of the lack of funds. A diffusion programme can apply to more than an enormous microfilm project. Federal and provincial records of no interest to federal and provincial archives scheduled for destruction, should be transferred to the appropriate regions if an interest is expressed in acquiring them. Also, the present state of technology could be used to develop computerized bibliographical services for archival institutions and archives would provide research services by computer output and microfiche links such as are used by our police forces in this country.

I have attempted to present some of the options on one of the most controversial aspects, at least to archivists, in the Symons' *Report*. In its wisdom, the Committee on the Historical Profession of the C.H.A. has rejected the concept of the regional archives network because funding will not be available, and the universities will never improve their track record. Now, I cannot accept such negativism. Symons stated that archives are the foundation of Canadian studies. Not just the chapter on archives, but various other chapters are sprinkled with recommendations of this order. I hope that the Association for Canadian Studies will go on record as strongly supporting Symons' major recommendation, which is, in my opinion, the creation of the national network which will promote a rational collection development programme with all its various ramifications.

# Audio-Visual and Museum Resources and Canadian Studies

William Young
Sandy Bernett
Frank Corcoran

# William Young

The title of my presentation should be "A Chapter Revisited" because I worked on the chapter in the Symons' *Report* in 1973-74 just after I left the AUCC and joined the CRTC. I have seen little of it since that time so the present talk gave me a chance to reflect on it once again. The chapter was prepared by me with the help of several people, primarily among them Ken Larose, of the AUCC, along with many experts who made comments and critiques some three or four years ago. What I would like to do today is both describe how the subject was attacked and describe the frustrations that sometimes accrued to that. I would like to look at what has changed over the intervening period.

To begin with, Tom Symons convinced me of the utility of a chapter on audio-visual resources in the aid of Canadian studies on the basis of this country's historic fascination with communication in all its forms, in particular, the interest and often the commitment made to audio-visual facilities and products by many of Canada's universities, primarily in the 1950's and the 1960's.

The universities that I know best, in that period, were making serious commitments indeed. In many cases, they were filled with optimism especially about educational television (ETV). Unfortunately, this optimism has left a legacy of frustration and some bitterness behind it. But strangely enough, audio-visual resources continue to be used, often in a very different form from what was originally conceived in those heady days of the '60's. In recent years it is a much less controversial usage but perhaps a more effective usage as well.

The original interest in the '60's was primarily in broadcast-quality media-centres capable of spewing out taped courses to all corners of the campus. This naturally was going to alter the traditional relationship of teacher to student and, in fact, it did alter that relationship in some instances. It certainly altered the relationship of administration to teacher. Any of you familiar with the Scarborough College experiment in Toronto are familiar with that disaster, I am sure. On this massive scale it seldom worked. What we see today, on the other hand, is the development and distribution of even more professional audio-visual materials by provincial broadcasters like the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, Access, and Radio-Quebec. There is a continuing use of National Film Board films; the documentaries are continually in use. CBC is finally in the act. I might add that these provincial organizations that I named did exist in the study period in 1973-74, but they were just getting off the ground, and their total budget at that time was about 15-20 million dollars. Their budget as of this year is about 43 million dollars.

On the campuses, modest productions on portable video tape recorders, audio tapes and slide sets have quietly grown to be the norm. These less ambitious productions exist side by side with the polished professional products from the NFB and the provincial organizations. It is apparent that many teachers and students are using both kinds with no fanfare and as a matter of course.

But let us go back to the study which illustrates the problems of specifying, with hard statistics, how significant a phenomenon we are discussing.

We began our study by identifying the 33 universities that had so-called media centres. We posed questions to media directors about their productions and about their acquisition of materials, particularly in the areas of Canadian studies. An extraordinary number of these people replied that they had little or no information about the content of university productions or holdings. They could give us information about hours of use, about costs, but not about content. They could occasionally determine what faculties, schools or departments were heavy users of media facilities – psychology, medicine and sociology tended to be leaders – but the identification of what was on a tape was usually left to the user and not to the media centre. Moreover, many of the media directors pointed out that they had no control of, and kept no record of, small scale productions done with portable equipment by individual teachers. Nor, finally, had they any idea of whom, if anyone, had borrowed or bought NFB films on their campuses.

In going to the media centre directors then, which seemed a logical step at the time, we had clearly gone to the wrong constituency for information about media resources, much less media resources on Canadian studies. There were exceptions to this. There were examples of thoughtful and innovative productions by some media centres, but in too many instances the media directors tended to work with relatively few faculty and controlled, or had knowledge of, only a part of the university's media acquisitions. I should add, parenthetically, that some of them did, on occasion, try to involve faculty, but with a notable lack of success.

The Symons' Commission *Report* speaks to this problem of a lack of information and makes a series of recommendations to centralize information about the identity and the where-abouts of audio-visual support materials on campus. I should note in passing that those universities that could respond to questions about their own productions relevant to Canadian studies, indicated that more work was being done with audio-tape, at least at the time of the study. It is, after all, a cheaper and more flexible medium than video tape.

An important question we put to the media centre directors was how much media material was exchanged among the universities. We found that at that time exchange was infrequent, even between universities in very close proximity to one another. In Ontario, however, a system was being established for such an exchange. It was called the Higher Education Learning Programme Survey, and appropriately enough, that is shortened to HELPS. The survey has lead to a catalogue of about 500 items available for loan, rental or purchase. Similar programmes are apparently being established as well in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

In the period 1973-74, having received largely erratic information from the universities, we then turned, perhaps in desparation, to the major audio-visual production agencies: the National Film Board; CBC Learning Systems, which sell audio tape series of specialized and academically useful CBC radio programmes in series; and the then-youthful, but burgeoning Ontario Educational Communications Authority (OECA). In the context of the Commission's rather open definition of Canadian studies the vast majority of the audio-visual resources distributed by these agencies can fairly be described as Canadian studies resources. People may want to quibble with this, but we decided it was so, and after a good deal of investigation we found the classification held true for most of the material. Therefore, we used it as a standard throughout the *Report*.

By checking with the NFB, CBC, and OECA, we received the following figures for sales or loans to post secondary institutions. The OECA, for example, in the period 1971 to 1973, had sold 64 programmes to universities. Just before leaving Ottawa to speak here, I checked with OECA to get the 1977 figure and it has grown to 1,350 programmes purchased by universities. The CBC Learning Systems were doing business with virtually every university in Canada and some in the United States. Each month they were shipping 1,500 audio tapes of one half hour or one hour duration plus 380 CBC records (205 of music and 175 of speech and poetry). They also, incidently, sold about 3,000 books each month based on CBC programme material. Again, at that time, we collected figures from the National Film Board on sales to universities and colleges, and they had grown dramatically in the period leading up to the *Report*. From 1970 to 1971 for example, they totalled 477 sales. In the period 1972-1973, there were 2,200 sales. National Film Board loans to universities and colleges in the 1970 period were about 16,000. By the 1972 period this had doubled to about 33,000. Now this was all very refreshing news for us since it did indicate a very substantial use of media resources suitable for Canadian studies at the post secondary level, and the source of the information seemed to be quite reliable.

There was, however, one very sour note indeed. Virtually all responses to our questionnaire came with an attachment describing great frustration in obtaining documentary film from the CBC. Particular series were identified that the universities considered especially appropriate for Canadian studies in History and Political Science. These included the CBC's "Tenth Decade", "First Person Singular", and "The Days Before Yesterday" to mention just a few. The CBC responded to our inquiry about this by stating quite adamantly that the Corporation would not and could not clear copyright for such materials. Fortunately, this policy has been reversed and the series named, and a great many more, are now available through the National Film Board for sale or loan on regular NFB terms. The Symons' Commission made a recommendation to this effect and I would like to think that the Commission's manifest concern about the accessibility of such documentary material speeded along the CBC's change of policy and helped to give birth to their so-called "Further Use" programme.

There were other changes as well between 1973 and 1977. The *Report* noted at that time, for example, that about 79% of the audio-visual material available to the educational sytems in Canada came from the United States. Because of the development of provincial agencies, this is almost certainly changed dramatically. Unfortunately, we cannot collect the figures for this, but OECA, Access Alberta, Radio-Quebec and Saskamedia in Saskatchewan, are producing and/or distributing new materials almost daily. Between these provincial institutions and the national agencies there is, I think, an extraordinarily rich variety of non-print teaching materials available in this country. A large number of these materials are particularily suitable for Canadian studies courses and programmes. They seem so suitable that it would seem useful to me if these agencies could be invited to Learned Society Meetings to demonstrate the kind of relationship the material has to the concerns of the various branches of the Learned Societies.

I think, in closing, that it would be very inaccurate to assume, as many of us were told to assume in the 1960's, that the use of electronic media in course presentations works a special kind of magic. But the electronic media do have a function as enabling resources for the teacher and are an increasingly important source material for the researcher. To repeat a truism, the average 18 year old entering college or university today has seen about 15,000 hours of television, about 500 films and has read on his own initiative about 50 books. To date, the universities have not been fully conscious about this media literacy; although, they may be superbly conscious of the print media illiteracy. The point I would like to make is that for many educators in many situations the judicious use of non-print materials is more than merely defensible as it used to be, it is educationally valuable particularily in Canadian studies programmes and courses.

# Sandy Bernett

The Symons' Commission was so glowingly generous in its praise for the National Film Board that we have been looking over our shoulders ever since, in case somebody catches us not living up to our reputation. It is in that spirit of humility that I want to begin my remarks by correcting one contentious and misleading statistic for which the National Film Board must accept some responsibility.

Seven or eight years ago a survey was made by the Educational Media Association of Canada, of the audio-visual libraries of certain boards of education in the Metropolitan Toronto region. The result of this local study was an indication that about 80% of the funds then being spent on 16 m.m. film went to buy films originating in the United States. Probably because it sounded like such conclusive evidence of the decline and fall of Canadian content and all that entails, this figure was seized upon with the greatest enthusiasm, was rapidly generalized by heresay to apply to all audio visual libraries at all levels of education in all parts of Canada and even found its way, in the very best of faith I might add, into the Symons' Commission *Report.*

Happily, I am here to tell you today that it is not true. An introductory national study, by no means totally conclusive either, but genuinely national, conducted by our Media Research Division in 1975, discovered that the ratio of foreign to Canadian audio-visual material in educational libraries across Canada is not that spectacular four to one, but rather about two to one. Frankly, I think that if some two thirds of the film material available in Canadian classrooms is of foreign origin, that still represents a serious over-commitment of educational funds to imported products. But we must remember that that includes a large number of films in areas such as pure and applied sciences, technology,and social and linguistic studies where the focus is either acultural in the national sense, or intentionally concerned with non-Canadian subject matter. A physics demonstration or a film to enrich student's appreciation of an Etruscan sculpture is unlikely to be enhanced very much by the inclusion of the mandatory segment of Canadian content.

A much more encouraging and useful piece of data produced by the same survey which we did in 1975, was the indication that when it came to use of film in the classroom, about two thirds of the actual screenings were of Canadian films. Again, this should perhaps be qualified by pointing out that screenings were in areas like Canadian studies, history, geography, Canadian literature and the teaching of the French and English languages.

Frequency of use also varies a great deal with the level at which audio-visual material is being used. That brings me to address some of the questions raised by the Symons' *Report* more directly. Our study found that audio-visual use declined quite markedly as one moved higher up the educational ranks. Specifically, audio-visual aids of one kind or another were used close to 60 times per year by the average elementary teacher in the survey, just over 30 times per year by the average high school teacher, and less than 20 times per year by the average post-secondary teacher. The decline was still more dramatic if we looked specifically at use of film where the figures were for elementary school use, 16.2 times per year, secondary, 13.4 and post secondary, 4.3 screenings of film per participating university or college teacher *per annum*.

It was quite right that the tables in the Symons' *Report* indicate significant and growing use of film as a resource in the post-secondary classroom, and I think that that trend has continued on an upward curve in a very encouraging way. But the fact remains that the post secondary use accounts for not much more than one tenth of National Film Board distribution to Canadian education and that Community Colleges by far account for the greatest proportion of that one tenth or so.

Why is this so? Setting aside the fact that there are definitely certain university disciplines where film and audio-visual media in general are not particularly appropriate aids, I think that the answer is basically found in two closely allied words: availability and accessibility. Do the resources exist? Can you get hold of them?

I am very pleased to report on the availability side that some very real progress is being made, especially in relation to Canadian studies. To begin with, the Film Board offers some 3,000 titles in English and/or in French, most of which can find a place under a Canadian studies umbrella since they are simply variations on the basic theme of our national mandate, as outlined in the National Film Act, which is to interpret Canada to Canadians and to other nations through the medium of film. Provincial authorities such as OECA, Access Alberta and Saskmedia are rapidly adding to that body of material; although, in those cases, distribution and exchange procedures across the country are very uneven.

Most recently, perhaps this is the sort of signal triumph of the moment, the unavailability of CBC and Radio Canada materials that was so strongly criticised in the Symons' *Report* has come to an end. Almost two years ago, the last obstacles were overcome and a joint programme was established between the National Film Board and the CBC to promote the further use of CBC materials after telecast. There is a catalogue of currently available materials. Not everything that you see on television will be included in the programme of distribution of course, some items are not suitable and some are not available owing to various problems with clearing rights, clearing restrictions, or paying royalties. However, since just over a year ago, we have placed in distribution 166 CBC Radio-Canada productions, 107 in English and 59 in French. Among those, incidently, are the series *The Days Before Yesterday* and *The Tenth Decade*.

The user response to date has been very positive indeed. Although those 166 titles have been introduced in a phased pattern, of perhaps a dozen or so each month, the total on the first year of activity has been 16,000 loans through our 27 Regional District Offices and film library outlets. This means that, in the initial period, they are hitting at least as good, or perhaps at a slightly better rate of use, than the average for National Film Board films over the course of a year. If 166 titles seems like a pitance, we have to remember that the number is considerably greater than the number of original NFB productions that are introduced in any given year so that over a period of the next few years, it will amount to a very significant addition to existing resources.

Accessibility is the other key to increased use of film in post-secondary teaching. I would like to divide this subject into three subtypes: physical accessibility, psychological accessibility, and information accessibility.

The first one is easily understood. If the film that you want is locked in your department chairman's desk because he likes to use it exclusively in his classes, then you don't have much accessibility to it without becoming physical, probably with a crowbar applied over the desk of the chairman. This kind of problem provides a strong argument in support of the Symons' Commission recommendation that post-secondary institutions accelerate their efforts to establish and support well-run *user accessible* audio-visual resource centres to co-ordinate audio-visual services which are too often haphazard at best. I emphasize *user accessible* because I have too often seen beautifully appointed audio-visual centres with large film libraries accessible with one key, which always remains in the pocket of the audio-visual director who is always somewhere else. That is probably why the department chairman locked the film in his desk to begin with.

By the problem of psychological accessibility I mean the very real uncertainty and hesitation of many teachers when they are faced with both the mechanical complexity of a projector or a video play-back unit, and at the same time, the intellectual complexity of integrating a visual message into a traditionally verbal relationship between teacher and student. I think that the Symons' *Report* summarized this extremely well.

> *"For the most part, teachers who do use educational technology are the ones who feel comfortable in handling media largely because they have had the interest and the opportunity to learn how the media can assist their teaching. Their attraction to non-print resources, then, is not based on a revolutionary concept of education, but on sheer utility. As one brief to the Commission expressed it, educators should view media as enabling tools of access and research that should not be overlooked but always regarded as tools rather than ends in themselves."*

I would urge very strongly that colleges and universities actively encourage all their teachers to become trained in the use of the audio-visual tools of their trade.

Finally, there is the question of access to information about Canadian audio-visual resources. Since the Symons' Commission recommended that a conference be convened to establish a Canada-wide classification system for media materials and to improve cataloguing, no such definitive conference has occurred; however, there is increasing activity in this direction. For the past several months a Film Board task force has been discussing the pros and cons of a national information system, data base, union catalogue, distribution system – the terms are interchangeable at the moment because the conclusions are yet to come – at any rate, an information and distribution system which would be concerned particularly with Canadian film and audio-visual resources. Our conversations have included educators at all levels; federal and provincial, cultural and educational authorities, and Canadian private sector film producers and distributors. Unfortunately, as I said, the analysis is not yet completed so I cannot give you any specific information on its findings. There is, however, definitely an interest and the readiness to co-operate which is really encouraging.

In closing, I want to touch briefly on one other point that was raised in the Symons' *Report*. In the *Report* it was noted (attributed to a national film board source) that in the period in question (1971-72), those 16 m.m. titles most actively used at the post secondary level represented a type of film which was experimental in nature. Apart from two or three exceptions to this statement, these films appeal to the sensibilities, enhancing feeling and awareness, rather than interpreting content as subject matter in the traditional sense, leading to the possible conclusion that the experimental is in more demand by institutes of higher learning than the traditional content-oriented film. At the same time, the Symons' *Report* continued with the observation that a number of universities and colleges stated that they do not use content information types of film because they believe such films to be unsuited to the needs of the curriculum. The point was made by others that the film medium is not itself well suited for instructional purposes. The Commission was kind enough not to agree with this latter point of view, and I am pleased to agree with their disagreement. It is true that a film is not a book. The experience of seeing is much more immediate, more fleeting, probably more subjective, certainly more sensory than the experience of reading, reflecting and re-reading to which the printed page has conditioned most of us. That does not make the film a better or worse teaching tool but merely a very different one. It is in this sense that I generalize to say that there is no such thing as an educational film per se but rather that all films can serve as learning resources.

This said, there is always room for more exchange on the subject of what new films would be most useful. An NFB film maker discussing the question, made this comment:

> *"Good films come from inspired film makers and inspired groups of people. What should happen more often is that film makers should be working in the field, should be exposed to the problems and issues and formulate their own ideas. Send film makers out to see what is happening to their films and then let them come up with ideas and make the films."*

During this conference, my colleague, Ron Dick, and I have had the opportunity to discuss some very exciting film ideas with many of you. Whether any of those ideas will reach the screen in a recognizable form, I suppose is an open question. But surely some films some day will be enriched by those exchanges. Films made by decree seldom match the quality of films that are made because of the film maker's personal commitment. We think that film makers who are sensitized to the needs of education by working closely with teachers and with students are the ones who most likely will make the most useful films for you.

# Frank Corcoran

My remarks this afternoon will be relatively brief in keeping with the section in the Symons' *Report* on Museums, which is also relatively brief. There is a total of, I think, four sentences in the Symons' *Report* which deal with museums. Two of them deal with my particular institution and although they are positive statements, they certainly don't cover the whole museum field by any means. I think it is regrettable that the Symons' *Report* deals so briefly with museums because there are more than 800 museums in Canada. Many of them have a wealth of information relevant to Canadian studies which they are only too happy to share.

The majority of these institutions are represented, or supported, either wholly or partially by public funds, and they collectively represent a resource that is not fully tapped either by students or teachers of Canadian studies. This afternoon, in the time alloted to me, I would like to get as much information from you as I hope to give. What I would like to do is to describe the programmes that I administer as a public servant on your behalf to determine what you know of these programmes and products, and to solicit your input concerning new directions or activities that we should be pursuing.

The institution which I represent is the National Museum of Man, one of four national museums that collectively make up the National Museums of Canada. This government corporation is for the most part located in Ottawa in 46 different buildings scattered within a 40 mile radius, operating on an annual budget of 47 million dollars. It is charged with a general mandate of demonstrating the products of nature and the works of man, with particular but not exclusive reference to Canada, and to disseminate knowledge thereof to Canadians everywhere. Our mandate would appear in many ways to be coincident with Canadian studies' goals.

In order to achieve our mandate, we collect, preserve, research and disseminate information. It is this dissemination function that is of strong interest to most of us. We do so by permanent and travelling exhibitions. There are about a dozen "museum-mobiles" floating around the country at the present time. The Museum of Man has 20 travelling exhibitions which travel to about 100 or more locations each year. They exhibit material made of collections that range from ethnology and archeology, to folk culture and history.

We also have a kit programme which was mentioned in the Symons' *Report*. We produce kits of material – artifacts, specimens, maps, charts, diagrams, teacher's manuals, films, slides, books, replicas – that cover things like Ontario pre-history, the Iroquois, and Inuit culture. These we distribute free of charge to schools across Canada. We ask only for evaluation of them as a means of charging for this particular service. These particular kits are being copied by institutions in Germany, France, England and the United States.

Each year we publish approximately 12,000 pages of scholarly material, and a wide selection of so-called popular and non-scholarly material. If you multiply that by the 25 to 30 museums which are publishing in Canada – and 95% of their published material is on Canada – you have a wealth of material remarkably little of which is fully used. While some of it is rather esoteric, some of it is also comparatively popular. We publish booklets, leaflets, and fact sheets on ethnology, archeology, folk culture and history (including military history). We publish *The Urban History Review*. We also produce *Canada's Visual History*. This project has met all our expectations in terms of quality and yet it appears to be little known by either students or teachers in the Canadian studies field. We have contacted historians across Canada about the project.

We divided Canada into different temporal, geographic and subject zones and produced a series of slide sets and publications that should definitely be of interest to students of Canadian studies.

How many have heard of our visual anthropology programmes produced by the Museum of Man? During the last year we have produced seven films. Some of these films have received favourable comment at a number of film festivals. Two go to the New York Film Festival next week, but this activity in Canadian studies goes unnoticed by people. A number of *Communique: Canadian Studies* which I co-edited, is concerned with nothing but museum resources.

The thing I find frustrating is that we are an agency which consumes a fair amount of tax dollars and we have produced things that seem to be used as models in other countries, by other institutions, but which are not recognized in Canada.

# A Canadian Context For Business Studies

Stanley Shapiro
Roger Hall

# Stanley Shapiro

I was invited here to speak on how the Symons' *Report* viewed business education, and on how valid I believe those comments and observations were. The central theme of those three or four pages in the *Report* – and I don't know what conclusions to draw from the fact that the total coverage of business is somewhat less than with other disciplines – but the central theme is that the importation of American educated professors, American curricula and teaching materials, has been somewhat overdone, and that moreover, this importation was carried out without any possible thought of ill-consequences. I would like to return to this issue after I deal with some of the more specific aspects of the *Report*.

Symons comments that there has been something of a neglect of the problems of smaller businesses in Canada in schools of business education, with a possible exception of McGill's Office of Industrial Research. Speaking from first hand experience, I have to agree about the neglect of the issues of smaller businesses in Canada. However, I believe that the authors of the *Report* were sold a bill of goods by "I.R., McGill". Industrial Research, McGill is essentially a sales agency of the skills of the University to the community. What they have been most successful in selling is the scientific and engineering expertise of McGill University in a research and development, and in an applied technology sense. They have not been especially successful in terms of selling business expertise. Interestingly enough, in the United States, the Small Business Administration is about to launch what I can only describe as a kind of land grant college type of system for small business in which they would try to involve the universities in extention activities much as they did on the agricultural scale.

A second point made in the *Report* is a charge of complete neglect of both business history and economic history as a research resource and as a teaching aid. In this I would agree completely. Business education is guilty as charged here, except that the Symons people missed two points about other benefits of business or economic history that should have been made. For example, Alfred D. Chandler's magnificent study of the Dupont organization could have tremendous relevance in business history courses, and so could a Canadian equivalent. Similarily, in the United States there have been what I would call macro-marketing books, things like the *History of American Marketing: Settlement to Civil War*. That kind of thing is missing on the Canadian scene. Such books could include all sorts of interesting things like Bruce Trigger's treatment of this nature.

In passing, Symons makes some reference to a change in the scope of business schools by making reference to the names of programmes. This is rather indicative of a far greater emphasis, or attempted emphasis, a switch from schools of business to Faculties of Administrative Sciences. There has been a certain extension in scope. Perhaps this is best witnessed not in a business school, but in what Bruce Dorn has done in Political Science at Carleton. There is a relatively little and insignificant difference between the first year at Carleton and a programme in Public Administration and that of most MBA's in this country. I think we are going to see more of this.

The *Report* sympathetically points out the PhD dilemma. Business education is perhaps one of the two areas in all of Canada where there is a very serious deficit position in the production of Doctoral candidates. However, in the undergraduate area Business Administration continues to grow. The courses must be staffed, even if it is with a very unattractive student-teacher ratio. If they are not staffed and taught there will not be any money available for the Universities to underwrite some of its other programmes. The fact remains, then, that the United States schools are the source of PhDs. There is, however, a growing preference across the country, certainly at McGill, with all things being equal, a preference for Canadians and/or individuals who speak French. Whether the one or the other is more appropriate in Canadian business education I will leave it to you to judge.

The *Report* stresses the need for research on Canadian problems and practices and takes a swipe at the granting agencies for not supporting business research. In my opinion, this is only partially true. I would agree that some of our colleagues from the other Social Sciences, which have been established longer and who control the granting agencies, did do a frightful job on business education; however, the total number of applications from business sources, until quite recently, has constituted a very small sample indeed. Small universes provide very unreliable data. We anticipate changes.

There is talk about the need for Canadian teaching materials, especially texts. I would agree with the first of these but not with the second. The problems with the economics of textbook publishing in Canada were pointed out by someone else earlier in the Conference. The problems of something specifically geared for the French Canadian market – an even smaller market – were not touched upon. I would agree that teaching materials are needed, and we, like everyone else, will ask for money to do the job.

The most useful vehicle that we could use for business studies would be cases written in the Harvard tradition but on the Canadian scene and within the Canadian context. My friends at Western, and other places that engage in case writing, tell me that these things cost on the average, to do them right with the appropriate institutional framework, somewhere between $3,500 and $4,000.

The text book question is a little different. I would seriously question the need for an entire Canadian text in accounting, in finance and in marketing because as you will see in just a moment, many of the managerial concerns do not differ. What we have seen in recent years is a Canadianization of American texts. I did one for marketing. It has been fairly successful. Where I made my mistake, however, was my basic starting point, my basic presumption, that the Canadian text need be no more Canadian than the American text was American. In other words, we turfed out the demographics, we turfed out the laws, we included a section on the French Canadian market. What we didn't do in the first edition, and what we will do in the second edition, are things like dealing with the marketing boards, for example, and with a variety of other kinds of unique activities such as the purchasing patterns of the Canadian Government, foreign ownership issues and matters of this sort.

Symons is quite valid, finally, in his reference to Comparative Management. His reference to Japan and its styles is an interesting one, even though that is now changing from what I gather. But he is quite right; we have very little on international accounting and domestic marketing abroad. In other words, we don't look at what the marketing system looks like in East Africa as opposed to multi-national marketing. Of course, we also do not have Comparative Management.

Essentially, what we teach in business education could be broken down into three components. First is the institutional: the demographics, the law, the specifically Canadian components. Until quite recently we have been somewhat deficient in this area but I think some progress has been made. I don't think we can give Dr. Symons too much credit for this, since some of it must go to the size and growth of the market.

Secondly, there is a kind of an analytical component in business education, for which Symons mistakenly uses the term management science, which is only correct in one sense. The management science and business cycle tends to involve a great many equations where people are substituting rigor for relevance. In a broader sense, when you are talking about the use of analytical techniques, or policy analysis, you are referring to a major component which is rather difficult to Canadianize. I am not certain there is an appropriate technology for Canadian business study that differs from the one used in the United States.

The third major component is management: what is it that executives do? Our job in a very real sense is to train managers with savvy. This has a kind of international component since the problems are the same in many respects. How much for advertising? What appeals? What media? What objectives? How do you measure performance? But it also has a kind of institutional framework. What is unique about the Canadian media scene? What are the problems raised by media overkill from the United States? What are the issues involved in terms of two television networks and lots of cables, tax laws and things of this nature? I think, until quite recently, the business schools have been somewhat deficient in the institutional area and also in the Canadian context for managerial decisions. I think this situation is improving.

Now, let us look for a moment to the various disciplines that you find within a business school. I won't call them sciences; I am a little reluctant to call them art forms; so I will compromise by calling them disciplines. They are the kinds of things that you would find in any large scale business programme: accounting, industrial relations, so-called public administration, or management in the public sector. These strike me as relatively Canadianized. The whole framework of industrial relations and public administration has, of course, Canadian content in accounting, with its own sets of legal restrictions and regulations, and its own rules, which are somewhat different from those in the United States and the

United Kingdom. It has its own National certifying examinations which strike me as having adequate Canadian content.

At first glance, you would think that the business and government area would be Canadian, and to some extent, I think we find this to be the case, if you are talking about business and government interface, about how you expound free enterprise all the way to Ottawa for your subsidy and things of this nature. What we don't seem to have, however, are two things, one of them partly because of institutional framework.

The departments of Economics are miles away, ideologically, from business schools, and instructionally, as well. Traditionally, Canadian economic problems are within the perview of departments of Economics, and they don't do very much that would be useful within a business framework. All kinds of distance exist between departments of Economics and business schools. This seems to be an international phenomenon.

Secondly, we have not done very much with the management problems of the Crown Corporations or the specific management/government interfaced problems of regulated industries of which we have so many. There has been a recent grant to McGill which we hope will help us a long way in understanding this latter problem.

Marketing, my own discipline, is the next item. There is now a great deal of teaching material available on the Canadian scene in marketing, but there are still two major omissions in calendars and in the teaching programmes.

First, a relatively inadequate information on French/English differences in consumer behaviour exists. In fact, the whole French Canadian market phenomenon, in terms of consumer behaviour and all the rest, appears to have been neglected. Moreover, when I raise this issue with my colleagues in the French Schools in Quebec, they do not consider it a great matter of any relevance. There is one professor returning to Canada from the United States who has just finished his Doctoral dissertation in the area. His work might do something to establish incentive, but the fact remains that we really don't know a great many things, including who the French Canadian consumer is or what are the specific features of bilingualism as it affects advertising. In this area I have the feeling we are dealing with "ninth" level information. Just for fun, I once traced back some of the references on the French Canadian market in a recent study of French Canadian advertising. I found a 1972 book quoting 1965 articles by the same authors quoting 1958 sources. I did not dare go back any further.

Finance has a reasonable, quite adequate, Canadian content. You will find that money and banking is taught in any business programme by people who fortunately realize that this is not the Thirteenth Federal Reserve District. There is usually a course on capital markets and institutions. These courses break down in their treatment of the problems of corporate finance seen within a Canadian context. I don't think that this is deliberate and I don't think it reflects the American situation. What it reflects is a kind of temporary fascination on the part of finance professors with the joys of applied mathematics, rather than with the day to day problems of management.

You would think that International Business would be consistent with the Symons' emphasis on the other than American experience. In many respects it is. The one great weakness is the unquestioned import of problems. There is too much concern with the multi-national corporations and not enough with importing and exporting from Canada. There is very little on Canadian/American trade. To my knowledge, a new course beginning next year to be taught by Carl Bagey on the subject will be the first one to exist on Canadian/American trade. That trade accounts for 65% of Canada's foreign trade.

Organizational Behaviour and/or Personnel Management seem exceedingly weak in Canadian content. All kinds of experiments from other countries are quoted. Things like French/English differences in executive motivation or the impact of executive decision-making of a branch plant approach just are not found. This is an academic problem. We probably should replicate in Canada some of the same very famous experiments that have taken place in the United States, and yet we might lose a certain amount of academic "face" when doing it.

Well, having completed this review, let me return to Symons. The charge again, the importing of staff, technology and curriculum. This situation was possibly doing some harm and certainly doing the harm without thinking about it.

We do have a problem with importing PhDs. We have the students. Enrolment continues to grow. Even at the moment if you adjust for differences in size there are only about one-third as many students studying business in Canadian universities as in the United States, so our period of growth, I would assume, is not over. What we have found is a very considerable movement of young women into business. We find our business schools have an enrolment which is from twenty to thirty percent female. This growth seems likely to go on. We need PhDs and there seems to be only one place to get them at the moment.

Frankly, we have even more of a problem when we consider as well, the ethical issue as to whether we should hire a third world individual who has studied in the United States on a grant from his country. He gets his PhD and is about to be turfed out of the United States when he applies to Canada to teach. Hiring him will help us internationalize the curriculum, but it will raise other issues.

To close, certain types of research, obviously French Canadian/English Canadian differences both in situation, in the work scene, and in the excecutive office, need to be undertaken. Comparative studies on consumer protection and inflation accounting are a couple of other areas that come to mind. There should be particular emphasis on the Crown Corporation and the regulated industries. We need to study small business assistance appropriate to the Canadian scene, and what that means. In the behavioural area, we need to do some research on what for a lack of a better name I will call quality of working life. There is only a little research just beginning in Canada on this area.

# Roger Hall

Professor Symons observes of Canada that there is no other country in the world, including the United States, where business has occupied a more central role in national development. Now if this is so, and it is a persuasive idea, then you would expect that some knowledge of the history, of the process of business and business management, would be an essential part of the education of Canadian businessmen, or of Canadian historians, or of Canadians at large. That is just not the case. The reasons for this are what I want to discuss.

I propose first to speak briefly about business studies in general, and of the need for business history to be included, as Symons suggests. Then I want to describe quickly the state of business history itself, in the English language, in this country. Finally, I will look at what I feel are some of the obstacles to writing Canadian business history.

The formal study of business and management in Canadian universities and colleges is a relatively recent phenomenon. As Dean Shapiro points out, Symons laments that American ideas and American educated faculty appear to dominate the Canadian scene. Symons does not, incidentally, comment on the extent to which American ideas in business management are less American, perhaps, than international or multi-national. In any case, it is safe to say that we Canadians seem too frequently to adopt inappropriate American ideas or institutions, and to neglect very useful ones.

It seems to me apparent that Canada does have a distinctive business environment and always has had. Distinctive at least from that of the United States. Canada has, afterall, an altogether different legal and constitutional background, a different political system and, most importantly, an altogether distinctive tradition in terms of business/government relations. All of this greatly affects the contemporary business environment, and for anyone to operate successfully in that environment, he or she must have an understanding of Canada's past. However, that interest in business history is the one thing that we have not borrowed from the United States.

The study of business history in America has a long and distinguished past, and one of the ironies is that a Canadian, Norman Grass, half-a-century ago, helped to make this study a most reputable academic pursuit. At the Harvard Business School, students are encouraged to take business history, and those courses are offered by the school as an important part of their understanding of how to operate in the American business environment.

A cursory glance at most, but not all, of the 34 Canadian institutions offering courses in business studies indicates no such encouragement here. In fact, I could not find a university which offered anything resembling business history in other departments. Exceptions here are, of course, departments of Economics which offer economic history, but not usually business history. By business history I mean, therefore, not simply case studies of individual firms or statistical surveys of the growth of particular trades and industries, but also the investigation of the social backgrounds, the class origins, the political and religious connections of the business classes, the impingements and implications of government policies on business or in short, every aspect of the development of business in its setting within the community.

Why has there been a neglect in Canada? Some would say that there has not been, that from Adam Shortt to Innis and Creighton, economics virtually dominated Canadian historiography. But that was a particular type of economic history. One which could be used to show a national purpose, frequently a national political purpose. It is only since the late 1960's and 1970's, admittedly with some exceptions, that a trend towards business history in Canadian historical writing is discernible. Frequently, quantitative studies have much to do with the re-awakened interest. An example is Michael Katz's chapter on entrepeneurs and his demographic analysis of nineteenth-century Hamilton. There are others, quantified and more traditional, including the controversial work of Tom Naylor. These books, not withstanding their variety of premises and points of view, show a promising interest in Canadian business history. But it is still tough going and for reasons which are at least in part, distinctively Canadian.

The problem is records. The simple truth is that records for the proper study of business history too often do not exist in this country, or are not readily available. Businessmen have been, and are still, all too anxious to destroy their files and records at the earliest opportunity. Even if they are not, as Symons points out, there is no effective nation-wide programme in Canada to locate, collect or preserve historically valuable business records. Symons comments that, *"the value of business records to scholars in Canadian studies cannot be overemphasized"*. Well, to that I can only add chapter and verse. There are, however, tremendous obstacles to collecting and preserving business records.

In the first place, archivists appear to have been as reluctant as businessmen to collect, let alone preserve, them. But some sympathy is in order. To begin with, business records are excessively bulky. They are frequently absolutely voluminous and occasionally, wildly eccentric. The archivist must spend a lot of time arranging thousands of pieces of paper. The job is essential but it is expensive and rather thankless. A lot of historical skeptics over the years, like H.A.L. Fisher, the British historian, do not help much. Fisher concluded simply, flatly, that history cannot be made of laundry bills. But in a way it can, and the problems of space and processing are greater now than ever. For example, we can learn a great deal about the growth of a business class in a rural community through the examination of the chattel mortgages. Should the Ontario Archives, then, preserve all of those files, or microfilm them, in the expectation that some happy day someone will come along and analyse the whole thing?

Another great problem with business records is in terms of right of access. Businesses frequently have legal obligations with regard to certain files and they are thus restricted. Some firms permit research only if the result will be a positive public relations value, and after the proper, splendid, complementary volume is produced, the original files are destroyed conveniently. Others fail to open their records because they cannot appreciate why on earth anybody might be interested.

But all this has assumed that the records exist, or at least that businesses maintain their records. Retention is the exception rather than the rule. It is in the search for business records relating to Canada where the real difficulties can be found. Neither Canadian archivists nor historians have ever made a systematic search for Canadian business archives. Now you might agree with someone like Bill Kilbourne who suggested that the best business history written in Canada was E.J. Pratt's C.P.R. epic, *"Towards the Last Spike"*. But for those of us a lot less gifted with the language, something a little more prosaic is going to be necessary. A national survey of business records will make that a lot easier. There are peculiar Canadian problems. The search will likely have to be international as well as national. A branch plant economy means that many of the files and records relating to Canadian business activity will be located in foreign, and most frequently American, head offices, or at least, be in danger of being shipped there. Access and acquisition to these records requires no little statesmanship. Symons' suggestion that we legislate against their being relocated abroad to parent firms would be very hard to put into effect.

Extensive Canadian business records also exist overseas. To use a very prominent example, for much of its history Canada's status as a British colony made Britain the source of a large measure of economic bounty. In the early and mid-nineteenth century, for instance, no canals were dug, no railroad ties were laid in Canada, unless somebody in Britain paid at least a chunk of the bill. Any understanding of Canadian business then, in the first half of the nineteenth century, demands a clear comprehension of the British economy as a colonial capital market. Further, any appreciation of Canadian trade should be fashioned within an Imperial context; therefore, a canvas of sources in Britain relating to Canadian business seems essential. But no such canvas or survey has ever been made. Symons does not refer to these international activities, nor to the costs involved. Nor does he refer to the costs related to any archival activity.

With regard to Britain, I have conducted a small pilot project, sampling British sources, which suggests there are good opportunities. In the spring of 1976, I sent more than a hundred letters of inquiry to various British repositories asking about Canadian business records dating from the first half of the nineteenth century, and also about Canadian holdings generally. No specific mention was made of names of firms or individuals. The institutions were chosen from an historical manuscripts commission list, *Record Repositories in Great Britain*, and reflected certain areas of Britain which traded with Canada. For example, Lancastershire, with its industrial centres of Manchester and Liverpool. The responses were swift. Of 106 inquiries mailed, positive replies of some holdings relating to Canadian business were received from 33 respondents; 23 claimed to house materials relating specifically to the early nineteenth century to the period between 1812 and 1854; 13 of these 106 were uncertain of opportunity in their holdings, or suggested other possibilities; 45 identified nothing at all; 7 thought there might be something but probably not; and only 8 agencies, including incidentally, the Bank of England, failed to respond at all.

Then, the following summer, I made personal visits to some of the positive respondents to see what the materials were really like. The results have been extremely encouraging. University archives, private firms and banking corporations proved to be the most useful repositories. Substantial holdings relating to the pot and pearl ash trade in British North America, especially with Upper Canada during the Napoleonic Wars and immediately after, were identified. Extensive correspondence relating to the failure of the Bank of Upper Canada was uncovered as was considerable material exploring the capitalizcation of other early Canadian banks. Business records relating to trade ranging from steam engines to stained-glass windows and monumental brasses all came to light.

As far as merchants and merchantile houses were concerned, a good many names were noted and correspondence of both a personal and a professional nature with more familiar agencies and individuals was discovered. In short, there is a lot of good material out there, and there are other hopeful signs as well which update the general gloom suggested in the Symons' *Report*.

Symons did take some comfort from the possibilities for creating a strong Canadian Business Archives Council, but the bright hopes of 1973 were largely dead a year later. Incidentally, Symons referred to a Business Records Committee of the Public Archives of Canada, but he was mistaken here, as no such Committee did exist, or does. Indeed, the Public Archives of Canada has only one Archivist dealing with business records. Nor has a Business Studies Council nor a Business Archives Council emerged in Canada as Symons thought it might, despite the best efforts of individuals like Professor Ted Regare, himself both a business historian and an archivist. The essential difficulty is getting the magic combination of historians, archivists and businessmen – especially the latter – to work together.

The creation of The Association of Canadian Archivists in 1975, might produce an answer. This group has established a Business Archives Committee to advise businesses on establishing their own archives and also to identify business records throughout the country. For this Committee to be truly effective, historians and businessmen should have some role. It has been suggested by John Arthur in our 1973 article on business archives that universities appear to offer more security in the mind of businessmen than do public institutions such as government archives. It was suggested that businessmen might deposit more willingly through academics. Well, I think this quaint faith in academics, in universities, is probably misplaced. In fact, the most promising hope for identifying business records in Canada comes from a couple of historians, Richard Rice and Brian Young, at McGill University. They have initiated and carried through – with private funding; Canada Council shut the door in their faces – a survey of business records in businesses in the Montreal area over 30 years of age, both English and French. 1,500 questionnaires were sent out, 200 replies were received and 125 businesses were checked out physically. The results are an extensive listing of holdings to be published in a 250 page book this autumn (1977). Not one of the firms listed, including the Bank of Montreal, had an accurate idea of their holdings before the investigation was made. The Sun Life section of the book runs over 20 pages.

It is interesting to note as well that most firms had never heard of the Public Archives of Canada. They desired, once they were persuaded to do something with their records at all, to place them first in the Archives Nationale, then at McGill, and finally in Ottawa.

What can be concluded by all this? Symons' sentiments are right, a Business Archives Council must be created. Only then will records systematically be assessed here and abroad. The Rice-Young study shows what the Council might achieve. Some combination of the Canadian Historical Association and the Association of Canadian Archivists, and possibly business schools too, might provide the linkage for such a Council. Work with the British and American Associations for Canadian Studies would help a lot as well. But there have been efforts to float a Council many many times before, and that magic balance of historians, archivists and businessmen has never been there.

Peter McArthur, the Canadian journalist, perhaps described the right prescription for all of this in 1904. After the failure of a newspaper venture with which he was associated, he said: "Every successful enterprise requires three men: a dreamer, a businessman and a son-of-a-bitch". Well, surely in Canada we can fill all of these categories.

# Teacher Education, the Schools and Canadian Studies

George Tomkins
Paul Gallagher
Paul Robinson

# George Tompkins

It is worth recalling that A.B. Hodgett's famous indictment of Canadian studies in the schools in *What Culture? What Heritage?* Anticipated by nearly a decade Symons' criticisms of university teaching. Hodgetts reported that all the faults he observed in the schools were present in the universities in both the faculties of education and in the faculties of arts. He also reported that Canadian teachers were remarkably acculturated to their own provincial or regional mileux for the vast majority (80 per cent) had been born, raised and educated in their native provinces and were teaching within one hundred miles of where they had gone to school.[1]

On the first point – that of the quality of university teaching – there has been a growing concern in recent years that may have led to some improvement. Faculties of education, despite the severe constraints under which they operate on most campuses – constraints greater than those endured by any other professional faculties – have made serious efforts to improve the quality of their work. The increase across most campuses in the extent of Canadian-oriented offerings has been beneficial. Nevertheless, I believe that it is still necessary that in the words of the Symons' Commission[2]

> . . . *a particular effort be made by universities in the field of teacher education to ensure that future teachers in the elementary and secondary schools of this country are given greater opportunity to acquire a fuller knowledge of Canadian society, culture, institutions and circumstances than is now often provided in the curriculum of teacher education programmes.*

On Hodgetts' second point – that of the local or regional acculturation of teachers – I doubt that there has been much fundamental change since 1967 although it is likely that some student teachers are seeing more of Canada, sometimes by means of formal educational travel and exchange activities. We are still a long way from creating what Professor Bowles has called a national classroom, i.e. a means whereby teachers can work co-operatively across provincial, regional, cultural and other boundaries.

The problems of educating teachers of Canadian studies are inherent in the attitudes and structues of our educational systems, not least in the university segment of those systems. Of these factors, attitudes are by far the more serious. In a word, our educational systems, especially our universities, do not take teacher education seriously. There are many reasons for this, some of them rooted in the culture of Canadian universities – in what John Porter called *"the* *clerisy of the higher learning*".[3] It was that same clerisy that by retarding the growth of the social sciences in Canada – thereby paradoxically opening the floodgates to foreign social science – has refused, as it still does, to take educational research and the study of education seriously. Pedagogical institutes are important facets of the German and Soviet educational systems. Educational research in Great Britain and the United States is far in advance of our own. Curriculum development as a study of why, what, when and how we should teach any given subject area has come into its own in recent years internationally as a form of highly sophisticated applied educational research. While the questions posed are as demanding as any in social science – and none more demanding can be asked of any professional field – Canada has typically lagged far behind in cirriculum development. As a result we have in most subject fields been forced as usual to rely on American efforts. Thus in the social sciences, the work of Edwin Fenton, a Harvard Ph.D. in history, has resulted, in concert with leading American scholars and educators, in a comprehensive high school program, including teaching materials, widely used by Canadian teachers. It is safe to say that with our typical academic blindness and prejudice few Canadian universities would have sanctioned such a program although they sanction similar applied research in everything else from management training to social work.

It is a striking fact that the self-serving tendency for people at each level of the educational system to blame the preceding levels for failing to prepare students properly is not apparent in judgements made of faculties of education. They are frequently blamed for all the ills of the system by levels below and above them and by their next door neighbours. When I am confronted by the often remarkable ignorance of students in UBC's one-year training program for those already holding BA's – a group that forms the largest single source of clientele for most Canadian faculties of education – I reflect that I may be held responsible by both their recent undergraduate mentors and their future employers for the deficiencies of seventeen years of formal education. This after seven or eight months in my charge – a period shorter than a secretarial course and very much shorter than one in social work, business administration or journalism. Some of these average young graduates of an average B.A. program may end up teaching in an inner city Vancouver school containing fifty different ethnic groups half of whom, if they speak English at all, speak it as a second language. To the accompanying racial and cultural tensions of such an environment one must add the entire gamut of social problems endemic to the contemporary urban milieu. That we can seriously believe that the academic and professional training provided to such graduates is remotely adequate is a measure of our failure to take teacher education seriously.

The understandable but simplistic academic view that teachers are born and not made – and therefore do not need to be trained – collides with the unobserved fact that teaching is a mass occupation – if not a mass profession – *par excellence*. The total number of teachers in Canada exceeds the number of doctors, dentists, professional engineers and lawyers combined. Like training for these other professions, that for teaching requires at its best a wide scope ranging from demanding academic study to mundane methodoligical knowledge and skill. Rarely is it seen at its best in Canada for the low regard in which teacher training is held easily becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy as the efforts of faculties of education, based on the heaviest teaching loads and lowest budgets on campus, earn not undeserved criticism.

If my perception of how Canadian academics view teaching, teacher education and educational studies is correct, it will hardly be surprising to consider how they view teachers and schools. Their stance in relation to the current back to the basics, core curriculum or literacy controversy – call it what you will – is instructive. In the first place, they have tended to abandon all the normal canons of scholarly endeavour in both their diagnoses of and prescriptions for the problem, beginning with their questionable assumption that general standards of literacy have, in fact, declined. In the second place, the universities are using public pressure to force the schools to deal with the problem in preference to seeking genuine dialogue with elementary and secondary school teachers. This displays political ineptitude of the highest order given that public disenchantment with the universities is at least as great as that with the schools. Teachers, already blamed for all the ills of society, are rightly resentful when their supposed academic colleagues join in the chorus of criticism. These colleagues, prone to "doing their own thing" in the name of academic freedom, are in no position to demand that teachers revert to the system of bureaucratic control which Frank Underhill pointed to a generation ago as the greatest source of the mediocrity of our school systems.

Nor will academics find a solution in the imposition of structured programs developed by outside experts which, on the whole, had limited impact in the United States in the 1960's. If there is one thing to be learned from that experience it is that *"No matter how good an innovation may be . . . unless the teacher accepts it, believes deeply in it and possesses it as his own, no change will occur. Once the classroom door closes, the teacher is in charge"*. In a word, it is a myth to suppose that a politician, an administrator or an academic expert can determine what children are actually taught.[4] The triteness of this observation is belied by the fact that the social scientists, although the study of social change is their business, are singularly myopic about the change process in education. What is needed to reform Canadian studies in the schools is a genuine partnership within the universities among all those in all faculties responsible for educating teachers and a similar partnership between the universities and the school systems.

Both Hodgetts and Symons concur in their concern about the lack of comprehensive and holistic perspectives of the Canadian reality – the lack by teachers and students of an appreciation, in Hodgetts' words of their *"total Canadian environment"* or in Symons' word of *"A pan-Canadian view"*. If they are correct – and I believe they are – a first order for curriculum development in teacher education is to restore holistic developmental perspectives to the teaching of Canadian studies. The lack of such perspectives is not the fault of teachers. I learned my high school Canadian history in a traditional chronological, developmental framework – too often dominated I must quickly add by Hodgetts' *"nice neat little acts of parliament"*. I was subsequently exposed to the same approach in university. Later, I taught elementary and high school Canadian history for some years. Thus my learning was cumulative, constituting in educational jargon a true *'spiral curriculum'*. The current fragmentation of history and related disciplines at the school level combined with similar trends, including excessive specialization and empiricism at the university level, deny our student teachers any hope of a comprehensive view of the Canadian reality.

A related problem pertains to the prevalence of what Hodgetts called a bland consensus version of that reality. He reported that teachers rarely introduced historiographical questions or differing historical interpretations into their classrooms. A major reason for this was the fact that in their own university studies they were not introduced to paradigms of inquiry in the academic disciplines. As a result, faculties of education have often tried to do this, producing the *'curious irony'* in the words of one of Symons' correspondents, of their *attempting to introduce graduates to inquiry in the subjects in which they have majored."*[5]

Marcus Long was quite right when he said some years ago at the University of Toronto that teachers literally do not know what they are doing. This is because nowhere are they encouraged to take a reflective stance towards their teaching task. If I may be un-Canadian enough for a moment to paraphrase another philosopher, John Dewey, it should be obvious that the Canadian studies – or any – classroom will not be an intellectually exciting place for children until it is an intellectually exciting place for their teachers. It is at this point that teacher training and teacher education meet. We now have good historians, sociologists and philosophers of education in Canada who can provide 'Canadian content' regarding the social, cultural and political milieu in which teaching occurs. In passing, we should note that teachers in all subject fields – not merely in those labelled Canadian studies – require this kind of background. I am sorry to report that in British Columbia hundreds of teachers are still annually being acculturated to an American milieu through courses provided by two foreign institutions in the absence of effective in-service programs by our provincial universities, especially my own institution. One of these foreign universities offers its courses on site in the Okanagan Valley

While what is usually called the pre-service phase of teacher education clearly needs to be upgraded, a far greater, indeed a preponderant emphasis needs to be put on in-service education. It has been said in the United States that education is unique among major public enterprises in the paucity of resources devoted to the upgrading of its personnel. I suspect that this is even more true in Canada. In Canadian studies we need an emphasis in both initial and in-service training on what the Symons *Report* has called pan-Canadian programs, that is joint efforts *"providing students with an opportunity to participate in a planned program of studies about Canada. . ."*[6] Such a planned program must be interdisciplinary, inderdepartmental and interfaculty to a high degree with a strong input from academic departments, especially in history, geography, the social sciences and literature.

In conclusion, I would like to make several concrete suggestions for action along the lines proposed by Symons and as advocated in this session by Paul Gallagher and Paul Robinson. These might include:

1. Arrangements whereby students in one institution could do their practice teaching in another region of Canada. At UBC we already have an arrangement whereby annually a small group of science teachers does its spring practice teaching in Great Britain. Is it too radical to suggest that a similar group might do so in Prince Edward Island?
2. Arrangements for short and long term faculty exchanges.
3. Arrangements for long term student exchanges between universities at, say, the third year level.

4. The establishment of on-going summer institutes of 2-4 weeks' duration, bringing together practicing teachers of Canadian studies from various regions of the country to work with education faculty and academic specialists in curriculum development.
5. Efforts to sensitize faculty members – not only Canadian studies specialists – to specific issues or areas of concern such as Canadian materials. Specifically, it has been suggested that small teams of two or three persons might visit campuses across Canada to provide in-service workshops or seminars for faculty and students in such areas.

All of the suggestions described could be part of the "national classroom" advocated by Prof. Bowles. To the extent that all efforts would focus primarily on curriculum development in Canadian studies, they might be based on the core described by Paul Gallagher. Many of the ideas suggested arose out of the Forum on Teacher Education convened by the Canadian Studies Foundation in Montreal last November. Through that Forum and other activities of the Foundation since 1970, a number of us in faculties of education in such institutions as Dalhousie, Moncton, Laval, Toronto, Manitoba, Calgary and UBC are prepared to take initiatives in developing a long range major pan-Canadian proposal in teacher education. This would be in collaboration with our colleagues in the various Canadian studies disciplines. Through our associations with the Foundation, the Council of Ministers of Education, the Secretary of State, Canada Council, individual ministries of education and most teachers' federations, including the Canadian Teachers' Federation, we believe that the possibilities for funding such a proposal are good. We would like to suggest that it be developed under the aegis of the Association of Canadian Studies as a possible field project. Such a project as the major educational endeavour of the Association would make good sense because (1) it would be university-based and directed to the largest single client group of most Canadian studies faculty, namely actual or prospective classroom teachers; (2) by the same token it could have a major impact on pre-university education; (3) it would give visibility to the Association in all major constituencies in Canadian education; (4) it could be a modest but viable step towards promoting those national goa's in education that the recent OECD report found so sadly lacking; (5) it would be consistent with the Symons *Report* recommendation for pan-Canadian initiatives in Canadian Studies.

Finally, I would like to propose as a major recommendation of this conference that the Association of Canadian Studies seek funding to convene a small task force for the purpose of developing a proposal by January 1, 1978 for a national inter-university project in teacher education to involve faculty members from education and relevant academic disciplines.

## References

1. A.B. Hodgetts, *What Culture? What Heritage?* Toronto, 1968.
2. T.H.B. Symons, *To Know Ourselves,* Ottawa, 1975, Vol. I, p. 134.
3. John Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic,* Toronto, 1965, p. 494.
4. OECD, *Styles of Curriculum Development,* Oslo, 1973, p. 43.
5. T.H.B. Symons, *op. cit.,* p. 197.
6. *Ibid.,* p. 127.

# Paul Gallagher

I have had the opportunity, for the last two years and more, to meet with teachers, curriculum consultants, and school administrators in every province of Canada. When I have been temperate enough, I have listened to what they had to say about what I might loosely call for the moment Canadian studies.

I have also had the opportunity, during the same period, to meet on several occasions with the Curriculum Directors of the various provinces. And I have listened to an earful.

It is largely on the basis of these 'meetings' that I base the rest of my remarks.

Allow me first to share with you some of my impressions.

1. There has been a great increase in 'Canadian' studies in schools throughout Canada. Certainly, the Hodgetts' criticism of 1968 that schools were not doing enough, in a quantitative way, about the study of Canada ten years ago, is no longer applicable. The problem, if indeed there is a problem, is not quantitative.
2. There is a genuine, broad concern within the senior levels of Canadian educational bureaucracies about 'Canadian' studies. Virtually all of the Department of Education people who could advance, passively resist, or actively obstruct new developments in Canadian studies are positively disposed to this area of concern.
3. Many Canadian educators, in the classroom and beyond, are still very reticent about, if not apologetic about, too much Canadianism in the schools of Canada. To illustrate, I have talked to, or at, at least 30 groups of educators in the last two years; I can recall only two occasions when the following question was not asked: *"Yes but, isn't there a danger of going overboard on this Canadian thing?"* There is, of course, a theoretical danger, but I don't expect to see the day when that danger – of knowing ourselves too well – is a real one.
4. There are many excellent new departures in the area of curriculum in several parts of the country, in the field of Canadian studies. I think it is correct to claim that there is no more active area of curriculum study throughout Canada today than Canadian studies. It seems equally correct to claim that, with the possible exception of Manitoba, each one of these new departures has developed independently and, in short, most educators are not aware of

what is going on elsewhere. The result is both big gaps and a considerable duplication of effort and activity.

5. Canadian education everywhere is well into a period of economic restraint. One consequence is that either resources will be squandered or there will have to be some establishment of real priorities. It is my impression that Canadian education is currently on a path leading to a dispersal of educational energy and resources, at a time when a concentration is far more appropriate.

If my impressions are correct, or even in the correct direction, I would argue that constructive changes are desirable, possible, and feasible.

My first argument is that it is now opportune to create better and faster mechanisms of exchange of information on what is actually going on, and what is planned, in the field of Canadian studies. We simply cannot afford, either financially or educationally, to remain oblivious to what is going on elsewhere. A central or common functional depository of information is, in my terms, an absolute priority.

My second argument is that, while in no way suggesting a uniform national system of education for Canada, it is in our collective interest to establish common priorities where we can, and to deal with common concerns collaboratively. As one of these common priorities, I see the real need to identify a common core of Canadian studies available to students from coast to coast, to translate this core into functional curricula within provincial systems of education, and to develop the materials necessary to support these curricula. People associated with the Canada Studies Foundation have been at work in identifying a core consistent with one perception of Canadian Studies – and I would be the first to agree that there are other cores and other 'curriculum models'. No matter how successful this effort may be, it will only be a starting point. Curriculum specialists and teachers throughout Canada, in collaboration, will need to translate this core, and to develop appropriate materials, if what is now being done is to have any real chance of reaching students in classrooms throughout Canada. I suspect that this second argument could be summarized by saying that the need is not for more Canadian studies, but for better Canadian studies which reflect a total Canadian reality, not simply yours or mine.

My third argument is that I have been persuaded, particularly by my experiences of the last two years, that no amount of fiddling with courses of studies or development of new materials or curriculum policy guidelines will have as much impact on students' learning about Canada as will developments in the field of teacher education. I am persuaded, now more than ever, that the only real change agent in the classroom is the teacher – all the rest is really only supportive. Hence, the education of teachers – in faculties of education and elsewhere in our universities – is the real key.

It is on this basis that the notion of a National Classroom fascinates me. In a period of restraint – and we will always be in one that will differ only in extent – it is far more practically realistic than Spicer's proposal for subsidized cross-Canada travel for all Canadians. At a time when Canadian educators still retain undue deference for their colleagues south of the border and present them as experts when we have our own expertise right under our own nose, the National Classroom could develop indigenous Canadian educational leadership.

At a time when collaboration will be productive, and isolation and rivalry counterproductive, the National Classroom would provide a practical method of initiating co-operative efforts. In circumstances where the implementation of better Canadian studies is at least as important as development, what better way to reach those who will be in the best position to affect those who contact, on a daily basis, the students right in the classroom? At a time when mutual understanding and mutual respect among Canadians of all descriptions is the most critical social need as well as a basic obligation of Canadian school systems to individual students, the National Classroom might well be the instrument to give this focus and this impetus to Canadian studies everywhere in Canada – to see Canada studies as the nucleus of any Canadian studies program.

# Paul Robinson

Eskasoni is an Indian community located on the shores of the Bras d'Or Lakes in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. A continent removed on the north central coast of British Columbia is Waglisla, also an Indian community of similar size and beauty. Opportunities to work with community peoples and teachers in both locations serve to illustrate the priority concerns of this article. At the classroom level the failure of Canadian education to provide any communion of historical, social, political, or economic understanding and awareness is undeniable. The education establishment, personified in government and teacher union bureaucracies, has abdicated its leadership responsibilities. In so doing, generations of young Canadians are relegated to a ghetto existence, knowing remarkably little about who THEY are as persons living in a diverse and increasingly fragmented federal state. At the faculty of education/teacher college level a similar condemnation is justified. Discussions with tomorrow's teachers from Dalhousie in the east to Saskatoon and Simon Fraser in the west reveals equally devastating shortcomings in what transpires in the name of Canadian education. Presently, teachers are being ill-equipped to do more than perpetuate the woeful inadequacies of the past. It is impossible to detect through first hand experience; a review of course syllabi; an examination of recommended course reading; or the qualifications of key authorities in university power structures that comprehension of Canadian society, in all of its manifestations, must be the core of any professional education worthy of the name. Teacher pre-service and in-service training today remains a satellite function of foreign influence.

It is a time for fundamental change. A plan for change in terms of teacher education, curriculum and learning materials is the substance of the following pages.

## The Education of Teachers

Canadian society requires teachers who are themselves prepared to comprehend the implications of life in a bilingual, pluralistic, federal state, and who are confident in their abilities to raise questions of justice and equality. Teachers are needed who understand social issues, who can explain the implications to their students and who are willing to be in the forefront of social change leading to an improved quality of life for *all* our peoples. Moreover, there is the pressing global need to have teachers who not only can draw out the important lessons from the Canadian experience in federalism and multi-culturalism, for example, but who can, in turn, relate these aspects of our heritage to developments elsewhere in the international community.

To implement the necessary teacher education programme requires an enormous shift of emphasis in current practice. Canadian social science can no longer be an appendix to existing teacher education curricula. Our history, environment, sociology, languages, literature, art (painting, music, drama), science heritage, developments and contributions must be removed from the closet where they have long remained hidden from the teachers of our children. The establishment of a Compulsory Canadian Core Programme in each teacher education institution can rectify the conventional neglect of the Canadian experience.

Two considerations should be borne in mind in the development of this programme.

A) Each mandatory course must be developed within a specific philosophical framework of the historical / political / economic / social realities which influence our lives.

In particular, the preparation of teachers must take into consideration such imperatives as:

**Bilingualism:** Officially Canada is a bilingual nation. Teachers need to be educated in the rich body of knowledge that is available to them in both official languages in each curriculum subject. It is inexcusable that English speaking Canadians have been denied access to a Quebeçois perspective of our history, due in large part to the education profession's preoccupation with the French language as an end in itself, and not as a means to improving communication and understanding in all facets of human endeavour. In French speaking Canada a parallel development vis a vis the Canadian mosaic is needed.

**Pluralism:** Interest in the ethnic diversity and multi-cultural composition of Canadian society, as these factors must influence education practice, is of very recent origin. Only in Canada's second century has the concept of a society composed of the peoples of many other societies, and benefiting from their individual contributions attracted attention. The values inherent in each culture can be woven throughout the fabric of education.

**Regional Diversity:** Geographical-environmental variation is obvious. Yet teachers are uniformly prepared as if St. John's, Winnipeg and Victoria are identical, as are, evidently, Frobisher Bay and Ottawa. An emphasis on regional understanding is not at excuse for fostering a parochial outlook. In an increasingly interdependent world, education must not shelter itself behind provincial, regional, or national boundaries. What has to be stressed is that in Northern Canada, as in other areas, the quality of life people seek should not be obscured, even diverted by an education system which is irrelevant to people's aspirations.

**Social/Economic Disparity:** The gap between rich and poor in Canada is widening. As these lines are composed in excess of a million people are unemployed. From a child's viewpoint approximately one out of every three school aged children comes from a home background where poverty is a daily reality. Teachers who lack a social conscience and a commitment to effecting social change are a luxury Canadian society can no longer afford, or tolerate.

**Global Interdependency:** The study of Canadian society, reflecting as it does many of the world's cultures in microcosm, is of value only if it will permit comprehension of the similar and contrasting characteristics of the human family. In this respect, particular emphasis must be placed on our understanding of the non-white world. Traditionally, any international understanding the teacher might have brought to the classroom was confined primarily to the western world. Viewing the world through a prism, the diffusion of colours being essentially red, white and blue is a myopic affliction to be eradicated.

B) The foregoing social realities must also provide the basis of an education policy common not only to teacher education, but curriculum development and learning materials preparation and selection. Unless an integrated approach to improvement in these three critical areas is adopted educators will continue to perpetuate their fragmented, often repetitive efforts. The education of Canadian teachers who are confident and competent in their abilities to teach relevant Canadian curricula employing appropriate Canadian materials must be the focus of our collective energies.

## The Compulsory Canadian Core Programme

### Courses

**Regional History:** Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Prairie, Pacific, Northern depending upon the student teacher's primary area of interest and concentration. Emphasis on social history including study of the literary, scientific, artistic heritages.

**Canadian History:** A survey course with emphasis on regional and social interpretations and avoiding the customary reliance upon central Canadian/parliamentary historians.

**Anthropology:** Emphasis on the original inhabitants, Indians and Inuit with an extension into the area of the origins of the non-native immigrants. Opportunities to study parallel origins in the rest of North America would follow.

**Sociology:** Emphasis on studying patterns of attitudes and values on an ethnic / cultural / social class basis. Subject matter to be drawn from Canada and the developing world.

**Linguistics:** Understanding the principles of first and second language acquisition with an emphasis on the unique problems specific ethnic and cultural groups have in developing fluency in second languages.

**Environmental Science:** Emphasis on the regional area of concentration with extensions to the remainder of Canada and selected global situations.

**Health:** The mental, physical, emotional growth and development of children with an emphasis on the regional area of interest.

**Curriculum Development:** Employing as a framework the imperatives mentioned above, emphasis to be placed on developing a three part school curriculum encompassing pre-school through high school graduation years. (An elaboration on the features of this curriculum is provided in the next section of this article.)

**Learning Materials:** The success of the curriculum is dependent not only upon the competency of the teacher but on the availability of pertinent text books, library resources and audio-visual items. Emphasis to be placed on locating, evaluating and selecting Canadian materials from within and without the region of interest. Supplementary materials available on an international basis should also be included.

**Methodology:** How does one teach most effectively in eastend Vancouver; Northland's School Division in Alberta; St. Boniface, Manitoba; Brockville, Ontario; the Gaspe of Quebec; rural Atlantic Canada; the Arctic coast . . .? Drawing upon these, and related Canadian experiences, and from major developments abroad (e.g. UNESCO, Canadian International Development Agency, China, USA, Denmark, Cuba, Britain . . .) teachers can acquire the understanding and skills appropriate to particular locations and appropriate to the curriculum and materials used in the classroom.

These courses represent what could be offered in a one/two year programme (depending upon the utilization of summer sessions and inter-sessions along the lines of the professional development programme available at Simon Fraser University, for example). The inclusion of classroom observation, teaching practicums, and opportunities for specialization in the various disciplines can in many cases be drawn from existing institutional practices. It is assumed that in each instance the area of specialization would commence with the study of relevant regional/Canadian experiences and then embrace knowledge chosen from the international setting. In this sense Canadian studies would not be limited to history and literature, but would include everything from Art to Vocational subjects.

## The Curriculum

The proposed curriculum would have three interrelated parts comprising the twelve-thirteen years of the child's school experience. Each part is evolved around its own unique theme, but in turn, the independent divisions reflect the realities of Canadian society. Throughout the primary-elementary years the stress in each subject would be placed on how people communicate through languages, mathematics, the fine arts . . . In the middle years the influence of the environment on peoples, and the converse, would provide the common focus. High School students would study the development of local, national, and international socio-economic systems of societies, working independently and cooperatively. A cohesive curriculum which emphasizes the common as well as the distinctive characteristics of humanity would provide a sense of direction to the total educational programme.

## Primary-Elementary Curriculum

In a pluralistic society, where two official languages are recognized, the need for a curriculum inspired with linguisitic understanding is apparent. The intimate relationship shared between language and culture is one major consideration. It is the key to educational opportunity. For children whose mother tongue is neither English nor French, opportunities to learn in the native language have to be made available. In support of this argument evidence is available (e.g. UNESCO) which defines 'language' as a compilation of what a particular culture regards as important. Each language incorporates into its vocabulary categories of information that have been useful to the society's way of life.

A consideration related to viewing languages as transmitters of cultures is the employment of the mother tongue as the means of acquiring bilingual competency. Linguists have recognized that within the first three years of life the acquisition of speech is virtually completed while in the succeeding years the child learns new words and recognizes the socially favoured pronounciation and grammatical forms. Proportionately, most of this language development occurs incidentally within the home. By the time the child enters school he is linguistically capable of learning in his own language. The curriculum must build upon this strength and use it as the bridge to learning the second language. Through contrastive analysis techniques the curriculum and indespensible support materials can incorporate language characteristics which have been heretofore neglected or ignored.

But communication when employed as the integrating theme throughout the curriculum should not be confined solely to the importance of the verbal component. The skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing should be complemented by attention to non-verbal communication. Particularly is this consideration vital to a multi-language society. Children who experience difficulty in acquiring fluency in either or both of the official languages must not be denied access to mathematics and science, as examples. The work of Zolten Dienes at l'universite de Sherbrooke is instructive on this point. Mathematics is a language, a way of thinking, a logic. To develop this approach it is important that the differences in the way a child thinks and, therefore, communicates, be understood. Child A may think analytically; Child B constructively. Child C may reach conclusions logically step by step. Child D may reach conclusions intuitively and then create a logical argument to support them. Each of these aspects of reasoning is essential to mathematical thinking; they should be recognized in the curriculum. For Canadian children the significance of Dienes' approach to mathematical understanding lies in the development of concrete situations, experiments, experiences which are created to overcome verbal language handicaps. Through observation, manipulation and investigation the child can explore mathematical situations which demand a language, and having gained that language for themselves in situations they understand, they can then use it with growing sureness and precision. Research into the question of how children most effectively acquire scientific understanding, as this has been conducted by Marshall McLuhan, the University of Alberta and the Nuffield Foundation in England, supports parallel practical and non-verbal learning experiences in science.

As one other example of the communication-based curriculum the status of the fine arts should be underlined. The importance of art, music and drama is elevated. The fine arts are perceived as means of expressing elements of cultures and traditions, and not merely as skill oriented subjects. Developing visual-artistic literacy is one more non-verbal means of overcoming the language barriers young children may face. So too with regard to the use of pantomine and the 'mother method' of using music to teach students a second language, as this approach was developed by Suzuki in Japan.

### The Middle Years

For young people between the ages of twelve and fifteen the dominating theme of their curriculum can be 'people and their environments'. One crucial consideration must be hammered home in the thinking of those responsible for curriculum planning and implementation. Environmental education, by definition, demands an interdisciplinary approach. In the stimulating 1972 Government of Alberta *Report of the Commission on Educational Planning* the following important observation was made:

> *. . . to separate environmental education from other education would be the ultimate in irony, treating its dynamic wholeness as though it were a specialized fragment – an optional course . . . There is NO option when it comes to environmental education . . . it should be integrated with all, or nearly all, of the subjects taught in our schools.*[1]

To this comment can be appended the supporting documentation and curriculum model as these are found in the Hall-Dennis Commission Report, *Living and Learning* of 1968. The validity of its proposals for an integrated environmental curriculum is strengthened when the increasingly perilous state of global ecology is recognized.

The mind-numbing tinkering with environmental curricula in the intervening decade since the publication of *Living and Learning* must create a feeling of urgency for complete curriculum revision in the minds of us all.

### The Senior Years

Economics, if made available to students (and that is by no means a certainty) has been a subject of marked inconsequence. It is an option – typically offered to a tiny minority of young adults in either the business ed. or academic stream. Yet economics is the determining force nationally and internationally, which influences the way of life of everyone. Only a decade ago it was possible to ignore, if not dismiss, the 'dismal science' as the metaphysical preoccupations of a handful of curious, if unknown, academics. Times have changed. Energy crises, international cartels (e.g. OPEC), inflation, the instability of world currencies, the emergence of alternative and influential economic, social and political systems in Asia (e.g. China), Africa (e.g. Tanzania), the Carribean (e.g. Jamaica) have penetrated the public conscience and are alternating our living patterns. How well is the high school population being prepared for these realities?

A case can be made for making economics the core of the curriculum. The resolution of complex problems upon which national and international survival predominately rests underscores this need. As portrayed here, economics is not defined in the narrow terms of a set of objective principles which can be applied as a poultice to society's wounds. On the contrary it is the art of drawing upon historical, sociological, political and geographical information and combining these with economic theory and practice which should be the nucleus of the student's study.

The ingredients of the curriculum can be illustrated with these five examples:

a) History: Canada's initial position as a colony of Britain and latterly as a fiefdom in the American industrial estate constitutes a study designed to energize the mind and the spirit. In a nation whose economy has been, and continues to be, controlled largely by foreign interests, the theories commonly taught in schools and universities, or otherwise generally disseminated, have reflected the character of the economy. One hundred and nine years of existence as a branch plant nation has played its part in developing an attitude of branch plant thinking – as Canadians we have little or no control over our destiny: as people we cannot be masters of our own house. Students should be given the chance to examine the evolution of our economic history, if our society is to be in the position of correcting these imbalances.

b) Part and parcel of the historic record should be the study of economic theories which have been developed by Canadians. Who was Harold Innis? What was the Staple Theory? How were the interpretations of Canadian history as written by Arthur Lower and Donald Creighton influenced by economic nationalists from downtown Toronto? What have been the implications of centralist theory and practice for western, northern, Quebec and Atlantic Canadians?

c) Political Science: Politics and economics share the same bed, with the latter frequently occupying the missionary position. The careers and ideas of William "Bible Bill" Aberhart, first Social Credit premier of Alberta; his disciple, E.C. Manning; the Bennett father and son team from British Columbia, can be compared and contrasted with the democratic socialism of J.S. Woodsworth, M.J. Coldwell and T.C. Douglas.

d) Sociology: Green papers on immigration, like Royal Commissions on poverty, come and go. Seldom has classroom attention been given to the economic implications of our multi-ethnic society. For the vast majority of students the social class stratification of Canadian society, as this has been analyzed by Blishen and Porter, is a body of 'survival' information shielded from their view by the pious dogma of textbook democracy.

e) Literature and the Arts: Supplying a useful foundation for the study of the economics of cultural developments and problems unique to our society is the *Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1949-51*. Students should have the chance to grapple with the question of cultural survival in the face of the onslaught of our neighbouring supermarket cultural colossus. Whether or not what is sauce for the American gander remains palatable for the Canadian goose is a question to be resolved by future generations of young Canadians. Their explorations of this topic should lead them to an understanding of the role of government intervention (e.g. Canada Council); the contributions and controls of multi-national corporations; the initiatives of artists themselves (e.g. Writers Union of Canada); and published works of poets, novelists, dramatists . . . The economic realities of Newfoundland life *(Buchans: Company Town)*; the insight into northern development issues provided by the poetry of Jim Green *(North Book)*; the examination of Canada's artistic evolution from a Marxist perspective developed by Barry Lord *(The History of Painting in Canada: Toward A People's Art)*; *The Fourth World* described by former president of the National Indian Brotherhood, George Manuel illustrate the variety of direction which should be open to the minds of inquiring students.

## Learning Materials

Quality Canadian prepared materials for use both in teacher education programmes and in the school curriculum are increasingly available.
The emphasis is on *quality*. One of the many myths in education centres on the notion there is nothing with which to work. More damning, if Canadian materials are available then by implication they are inferior to foreign products. Invariably this ingrained colonial mentality leads to the accusation, "oh, you mean if it is Canadian it is good and if it is American it is bad." Not at all. A profusion of miniature Canadian maple leaves in the margins of the text book catalogues of multi-national publishers is not an excuse for tub-thumping, flag-waving nationalism. What must be stressed is that through the use of accessible criteria (e.g. Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission, Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) a comprehensive range of print and non-print items can be selected for most curriculum subjects.

Establishing evaluation guidelines is a mapping exercise which indicates what to look for. Bilingualism, pluralism, regionalism, stereotyping, learning methodology, and economics should be priority considerations. The logical next step is to identify publication sources. Two broad categories should be examined.

a) Such quality materials as are available from the multi-national distributors and publishers can be located and evaluated.
b) The few large Canadian-owned publishers and the many small independent firms should become the centre of attention for those responsible for locating useful Canadiana.

Valuable resource books to draw upon for guidance should include the contributions of Sheila Egoff (children's literature), Irma McDonough (children's books), Margaret Atwood (literature), Jacques Cotnam (contemporary Quebec), Eleanor Beattie (film), Jim Page (thematic bibliographies), and Margery Fee and Ruth Cawker (fiction). Subscriptions to *Quill and Quire*, *In Review*, *Books in Canada*, *The Canadian Reader* and *Canadian Materials* are essential.

Use of these and similar resources will demonstrate the obvious. Throughout Canada from the British Columbia Publishers' Association in the west to its counterpart in Atlantic Canada and north to the *News of the North* (Yellowknife) and the *Whitehorse Star* (Yukon) distinctive regional publishing is emerging, even flourishing. Educators are obligated to become knowledgeable with these sources if the Canadian character is to be realized in the classrooms.

Assuming that it is practical to amass information on what the market place has to offer, the third stage of development is to assemble the materials by age and subject level. The importance of having a grasp of social realities will now come to the fore. Learning resources can be arranged by themes which will reinforce the Compulsory Canadian Core Programme for teachers and the school curriculum. The themes not only bring order out of chaos, but as importantly, the integration of content information across subject lines becomes something more than a figment of the educator's rhetoric. Students can study the nation's history through art. Music can be explored through the 'Sounds of

Nature'. Business education can be more than an exercise in words typed per minute. The pursuit of the ideal bland diet in Home Economics can be diverted. An overall education design which draws upon the support of many Canadian and some excellent foreign prepared materials can be realized.

An item-by-item documentation of what is available for use in schools and universities does have a hidden message. A picture emerges of where the vacuums are and what needs to be done. A short list of examples will indicate some of the more glaring omissions.

> *Our understanding of the world from a Canadian perspective is severely retarded given the usual reliance on foreign researched and prepared encyclopediae. Children who have been conditioned to accept a* World Book/Time Life *definition of what is internationally significant can scarcely be faulted for knowing nothing about Canadian economic imperialism (e.g. Brascan); the importance of diversification in foreign trade (e.g. contractural links with the European Common market), or the evolution of our foreign policy (e.g. Chanak Affair of 1922). Canada's scientific heritage is virtually non-excistent in existing materials. Were it not for the excellence of radio and television productions like those of David Zuzuki, "The Nature of Things", and "This Land", it would be impossible to know that science in all its dimensions is a part of Canadian Life.*
>
> *Available Canadian titles in the fine arts are how-to-do-it publications and not materials about painting, sculptoring, drama, or music. Items are required which will bring to the attention of students the ideas and master works of Glenn Gould, Joyce Wieland, Harold Town, Veronica Tennant, Kenojuak, and Sir Ernest MacMillan to identify only a small sampling.*

Alternative approaches to ways and means of filling these and other gaps exist for study and consideration. Lessons can be learned from the experiences of the Canadian Studies Foundation, CanLit, writers and artists workshops. Non-native Canadians should familiarize themselves with and learn from the exemplary efforts of Indian, Inuit and Metis peoples. Curriculum and learning materials development at the Indian Cultural College located on the campus of the University of Saskatchewan and the Ojibway Cultural Project based on Manitoulin Island are only two possibilities. In the Northwest Territories between 1969 and 1974 readers, collections or oral traditions, historical items, audio-visual materials, picture sets, periodicals were written, illustrated, filmed and recorded by a group of native and non-native individuals. The processes of production indicate that educators and lay people can work together on the publication of those items traditionally absent from classrooms and libraries.

Making it possible for people to develop confidence in their abilities to contribute those things they most cherish, languages, histories and beliefs is the heart of education.

## Notes

1. Report of the Commission on Educational Planning (Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1972, p. 192).

# The Universities and the Symons' *Report*

R.J. Baker
Lucien Michaud
Jeffrey Holmes

# R.J. Baker

Most faculty treat the Symons' *Report* as they treat the Bible: they have heard of it but haven't read it. A few are fundamentalist believers, accepting every word literally; some think it too kind to sinners; and some too optimistic about the millenium. As with the Bible, a few think that when it is complete it will make a good door-stop. Some of course prefer other bibles – women's studies, graduate studies, research, save our seals or save our sealers, values education, and so on. Fortunately, as with most successful holy books, it can accommodate a wide variety of faiths. A considerable number treat it as they do the Bible: they cite a commandment they like and would cite more if there were a good concordance that enabled them to find what they want without reading the whole. One could go on with this game indefinitely, I think: which chapter should be called Genesis, which Exodus, which Numbers, Judges, Kings, Chronicles, Job, Proverbs; and there is of course the Epistle to the Librarians, the Epistle to the Foundations; and we look forward to the Epistle to the Publishers. I must say that I have looked rather intently, with no great success, for the Song of Solomon.

I am not just playing games. The fact is that the *Report* is enormous. Inevitably, it provokes a very wide range of reaction, and indeed lack of reaction. As far as I can find out, on most campuses the proportion seriously interested is about the same as the proportion of our own faculty who have attended your meetings this week – 5-10%. That is not to disparage the *Report*. It is to emphasize that a university is made up of people with very diverse interests and that we all tend to use something like this *Report* for our own purposes.

In some ways, I think the major significance of the *Report* was the process that was used to prepare it: the visits to every campus, the enormous correspondence – 40,000 letters, I believe – the innumerable briefs, the slow realization, for people who hadn't realized it before, that there was something to be uneasy about in the number of non-Canadians in our universities. Often, some action was being taken on some parts of the *Report*, as a result of the process, before the *Report* came out.

Since it came out, a number of societies, learned and professional, have set up groups to recommend what kind of action should be taken, and a number of universities have established faculty or senate committees to examine particular parts of the *Report*. The great danger, I think, is that people will get reports from these committees, and perhaps endorse them, feel that they have accomplished something tremendous, and then quietly go on doing what they were doing before. With increasing constraints on the universities, it is very hard to find funds for new developments, and we are notoriously slow in shifting existing resources to other purposes.

The AUCC set up a small committee in February. It has had two meetings and will recommend to the Board of Directors in June that the AUCC assign a member of the staff for one year to follow up what is happening in the various societies and universities. The AUCC itself, of course, has no power over its members, except that of information and persuasion. Nevertheless, the assigning of a staff member to a committee has been very successful on other occasions.

Just as the Bible led to many important devotional books in the following centuries, I expect the Symons' *Report* to do so. I look forward to a 'Pilgrim's Progress' showing us how to keep to the straight and narrow and how to avoid Vanity Fair and the Slouth of Despond.

# Lucien Michaud

The concern for Canadian studies really began in the mid 1960's when the issue of nationalism in its various forms was brought up for debate. We could say that at this time some changes started taking place. I personally observed that when the AUCC first attempted to set up the Commission in the very late 1960's, under Dr. Jeff Andrew, it triggered certain reactions. Mind you for some, not enough, for others, it was already too much. The Commission itself did, during its visits, prompt a lot of people. I have observed at various universities at least a certain change of attitude and a beginning of action, because if you look at the actual building of Canadian studies programs in the various forms as they are defined, whether it be specific courses or the creation of a certain core curriculum with regard to Canadian studies, many of these have appeared on the scene in the early 70's so that the process was truly started in the institutions. However, I think I can say that there is a resistance to the Symon's *Report*.

I have heard executive heads, presidents, saying don't rock the boat, or don't give the press and the government a bat to clobber us. The universities felt that they had developed a bad public profile, and therefore they felt that this was not a very good way of promoting their public image. In fact, some persons have felt that we shouldn't even send the *Report* abroad because it seems to be too critical, too detrimental to our public image, so much so that it has been the object of resistance on the part of many. However, some university presidents have spoken in constructive terms about it.

Some of you may have read, for example, *University Affairs*, which has carried at least ten articles of various types since the launching of the *Report*, giving the reaction of the universities or the university community. It did quote, for example, an address by Roger Dadieux, Rector of the University of Ottawa, giving his comments, which were basically favourable. The same thing is true of an address by Michael Oliver of Carleton, or perhaps a little less in approval but equally constructive, the comments by Dr. Carl Williams of the University of Western Ontario. The trouble with these comments as we read them, is that of course, everybody starts by agreeing with about 95% of the *Report*, or its recommendations, and criticizes the remaining 5% with which they do not agree, so that we end up with sometimes a rather negative impression.

I think I can safely say that the statements that I have read by Drs. Oliver, Cadieux, Williams, Duckworth, and others are representative of support of the *Report*. The dialogue is there. The *Report* itself is getting some criticism, particularly those sections addressed to the university community. One has the impression that the *Report* has very little impact.

To provide perspective on this, I have attempted to monitor the reactions and the impact of a previous *Report* released by the AUCC, in this case it was the Bonneau-Corey *Report* on the rationalization of university research. If one read the articles, there was definite criticism. However, I tried to zero in on the 16 recommendations and asked myself how many of them had been acted upon. I found that about a year after the *Report* had been released, that at least 13 had been implemented in a very significant fashion. Some were recommendations addressed to individual universities, others to the universities as institutions and others were addressed to government. Sometimes, obviously, it is misleading to let the negative comments guide your review of the *Report*, and so I would say that we should not let ourselves be unduly influenced.

As Dr. Baker also indicated, a number of universities have set up committees to review the Symons' *Report*. The University of Waterloo set up a Senate Task Force in 1976; Queen's University has investigated the *Report* and has made a self-assessment; the University of Alberta did assign a person to report to the Faculty of Extension and to the university administration, the University of Toronto set up a task force on Canadian studies and has conducted a number of in-house initiatives to make people aware of this, including a series of lectures organized by University College in February 1976. The University of Victoria has had a Senate Committee at work, and Carleton University launched a new undergraduate programme in Canadian Studies in September, 1976. I think that all of this indicates that there has been a positive response, and that there is an effort to do some soul searching.

Most of us here are committed to the cause of Canadian studies. For this reason you will understand why I want to conclude with the following concern. Through no fault of the organization, we have not had our French speaking colleagues from Quebec with us here. I have not double checked the list of all the participants but certainly among the speakers, the French-speaking Universities of Quebec, Laval, Montreal, University of Quebec, University of Sherbrooke and the one French-speaking university outside of Quebec, the University of Moncton, have not really contributed. I do not want to say there is a strong sympathy in Quebec for the *Report*. You have but to read the introduction to the *Report* written by Larkin Kerwin, from Laval, to see that there is sympathy. The article, which was reproduced in *University Affairs*, by Marcel Granpré, indicates as much. Another article, this one perhaps not directly from a Quebec, French-speaking University, by Robert Choquette, from the University of Ottawa, indicates what I would call a positive response from a Franco-Ontarian, but I think that we can say that Chouquette voices the opinion also of others.

There is some response, but I don't think we should be again misled. The interest in Quebec right now is for the Quebecois, understood in whatever way you want. I don't know whether this Association, those of us who are interested in Canadian studies, can build bridges. It is clear that there is some form of resistance right now in the French-speaking academic world, particularly in the French-speaking Quebec universities, with regard to an involvement in Canadian studies. I simply interpret it to mean that for a French-speaking Canadian whether he is a separatist, or not, participation in Canadian studies could, in the eyes of his colleagues, be interpreted as a commitment to

Federalism. So there is a very delicate task, I think, here to be undertaken. I would hope that those of you here who have ways of reaching out and of maintaining contact will do so. I look forward to the next session of the Learned Societies to really see whether the bridges are being cut at the academic level.

# Jeffrey Holmes

First of all, I want to respond to the question, what has the Association of Atlantic Universities done about the Symons: *Report?* The answer is, nothing.

The fact is, though, it was quite a deliberate decision to do nothing. We did discuss it at a council meeting a couple of years ago and agreed that we should put all our efforts behind the AUCC reaction. I think the finest way we are able to do that is to provide the chairman for the AUCC committee (Dr. Baker of UPEI).

As far as the Atlantic Association universities responding individually, I can remember no public outcries or rage: no presidential, professional, or even student outcries. I don't think the Atlantic media has really heard of the *Report*, so we have not been troubled for reactions to it by our friends in the press.

In fact, I think, the Atlantic universities came out proportionately better in the *Report* than universities elsewhere in Canada. If you look at the references, even through the somewhat twisted glasses, you can see that the University of New Brunswick and Memorial kept coming up as examples of how to do things. It is the Ontario universities, I think, that are really being taken to task. They are not providing leadership.

Well, having done my Atlantic duty, I think the only other contribution I can make to this session is to put on another hat, one of an intimate observer of the process of getting the Symons' *Report* out and to the public. With your indulgence I will now not talk about what I was asked to talk about, but will go back to 1968, when as you remember, Matthews and Steele made some terribly unacademic noises, and even appeared on the front of *Weekend Magazine* draped in foreign flags. Well, I think Jeff Andrew at AUCC was in basic agreement with what Matthews and Steele were trying to do, but he thought the focus was a bit off, and that the real question was not now many foreign professors you have teaching, but what was the Canadian content of your total curriculum, not just of courses called Canadian Studies. Is there a Canadian content in Mathematics, in Psychology, in Geography and so on? There was discussion of launching a Canadian studies study, but it was aborted because the Canada Council declined to do it.

As editor of *University Affairs*, I thought about using a journalistic approach to uncover the status of Canadian studies in the universities. However, if you did a journalistic kind of thing, it would have no credibility within the academic community. What was needed was a thorough study to convince the academic community.

I think we all agree that universities will pursue the search for truth fearlessly, frankly and boldly, down whatever path it leads them, as long as it doesn't lead them onto the university campus itself, because the temple of truth must not be defiled by curious sight-seekers and souvenir hunters. I think Carl Williams' reaction was typical of Presidents. Carl's was the cleverest reaction but he is a psychologist, so you expect that. What he did was to take a handful of very good Canadian examples of things that The University of Western Ontario was doing, and hold them out for scrutiny. He was giving himself very high marks with his handful of pebbles. I think that has been the general reaction of universities. They say, *"well yes, you know, this is what we have got."* and then list some very good things, but then do not look at them in the context of the total record of the university. I think what Symons was looking for was a spirit of Canadian studies and it is not often present.

Well, back to my own involvement. I did work with Tom Symons somewhat in the early '70's when there was then the faint weans that the pregnancy was advancing but with exquisite slowness. There was some hope of potulation and so I was asked for some advice on publicizing it. I gave a lot of advice, and like all the advice I give, it wasn't taken. But then, when I heard last fall that the Book and Periodical Development Council was planning to do something on the Symons' *Report*, a popular version, I, in my modest way, pushed myself forward and insisted that I was the best person in the country to do it. I called together Tom Symons, Tom McMillan and Graham Gibson, who was the Executive Director of the BPDC. Now what they wanted, Gibson told me, was for me to pick out the odd sentence or points made by Symons, quote that, and put it up big on the page and then ramble on about it for a couple of pages, explaining in my own inimidable terms what this meant, and what it meant to the man in the street. I said, *"you really want it in my own words?" "Yes"*, they said. *"we really want it."*

The two Toms, both quite properly after that, said: "all right we want nothing more to do with it now, you deal with Gibson," and I did. I sent Gibson my first 6000 words on the first chapter, which was really the key chapter of the whole rationale. On February 3rd, 24 days before my deadline, Gibson and I met in Toronto and he said, *"Yes, very nice, it is lovely stuff"*. He paused and I said: *"It is not what you want? Is it flippant?" "Yes"*, he said, *"it is a bit. You see this is a very serious subject"*. I said, *"well you know the trouble with serious subjects is that everybody treats them seriously and if you are writing for the man on the street you can't do it quite like that. But you are paying, so I will do it any way you want."* So the result was that we agreed that I would do a straight preces of the *Report*.

# Canadian Studies and Science and Technology

Glen Palmer
Andrew Wells

# Glen Palmer

I am in agreement with the recommendations of the "Science and Technology" chapter of the Symons' *Report*, and I view the *Report* as a welcome addition to the body of literature which must be piling up in the Minister's office with requests, demands and exhortations to come to the aid of science in Canada.

My comments deal only with a part of Symons' section on Science and Technology and are not so much a criticism of it, as they are a modification of it, which, I think, might provide the same result.

I begin by assuring you that my reaction to this section of the *Report* is one of sympathy with the arguments presented, and by pointing out that this sympathy was a rather unexpected surprise to me. When I started reading the *Report*, I was among that group holding the opinion that there is no such thing as "Canadian" science, or any other national science either. That opinion is widely held, as the *Report* points out, and derives in a great part from the fact that each of us views science from a perspective of a particular discipline. In fact, if pressed I will still maintain that properly defined, there is certainly no Canadian chemistry, though I now recognize more clearly the Canadian aspects of disciplines like zoology and geology.

Along with this recognition of the Canadian character in parts of science, I found support for the main direction of the recommendations, but I am distressed by certain attitudes which pervade the *Report* and by the approach proposed to solve the problem.

To explain, let me first state what I believe to be the problems perceived by the authors. These are: First, a lack of study of and research into Canadian aspects of problems in science and technology, and second, a lack of organized presentation at the university under-graduate level of the history and development of science and technology in Canada. The solutions posed for the first of these in particular, and to a less obvious extent, the second, leave me disappointed.

The solutions proposed here would have been acceptable in the 1950's and in the early 1960's, but are not now acceptable, or in a lot of cases, I think, are no longer practical. In the 1970's, we should recognize that simply throwing money at a problem is not necessarily a solution to it, and that money to throw is becoming increasingly hard to find. To achieve certain goals, more money will be necessary. More money is needed today to support research in this country, but we should recognize that part of the solution might be effected by a reassignment of funds now available, or which in any reasonable society ought to be available. What is suggested in the *Report* is twofold. First, more federal, provincial and private funds, so distributed as to provide support and motivation or research into Canadian problems, and second, additions to the university curriculum of courses with a direct and obvious relation to the Canadian aspects of the individual disciplines, as well as courses in the scientific history of Canada.

Now I recognize that research interests are more commonly impressed from above rather than below, but I would like to take the second of these first in this case, because growth from below may be an important and a useful force to nurture. We at the universities have been guilty for some time of solving the information explosion problem, by adding to the curriculum more and more content to the required courses at the under-graduate level, and more required courses at the graduate level. The latter is an indication that some time ago we reached the saturation point, and are now operating in a sort of "metastable" state which remains in place only so long as external influences are excluded. To add more to this, especially on the grounds of nationalism, as opposed to some more fundamental requirements for completeness of presentation, cannot be tolerated by the system. What is required, and what I hope this *Report* may help force into serious consideration, is a fundamental and extensive reorganization of the basic approach to presenting science to the students.

It is time we recognized, in an operational way, that there is, as K.J. Ladler has said, too much to know. We should make a basic decision that we will not attempt the impossible. The economics of time, financial constraints and the limits of the physical stamina of our students, do not allow us the luxury of further unthinking curriculum expansion. If we are willing to commit ourselves to a restructuring of the curriculum, and if we see national identity as an important and neglected aspect of education, perhaps we can agree to use Canadian interest as one guiding principal. If we do this well, the Canadian aspects of science can become an integral part of the disciplines rather than simply adjuncts to the core or humorous anecdotes dragged painfully into lectures.

What I would like to stress is that this approach does not presuppose large increases of funds for undergraduate science programmes above, perhaps, the restoration of the shortfall we are now experiencing. It simply requires a considered attempt to use the funds to insure the exposure of Canadian students to the Canadian aspect of science during their studies of the basic disciplines.

If some of our universities were to take up this challenge, and by doing so foster a greater awareness of problems which are distinctly Canadian, we might expect this interest to stimulate research at the graduate level. As well, or perhaps at least, it should result in an increase in the number of graduate students and faculty with some direct knowledge of the existence and the importance of these problems. This does raise a fundamental question. If this were to be the result, would the funding for this research be available?

As the *Report* points out, funding of research in Canada is so inadequate as to be a national disgrace. At present, funding of research is contingent upon a record of successful research. Only senior scientists of international reputation, or with old friends on the grants committee, need apply if the research projected is in any way removed from their previous experience. It is not fair to say, as the

*Report* does, that the researcher determines what is to be studied. The researcher determines what he or she would like to study, and the granting agencies decide what will be studied. My lack of enthusiasm for funding-directed research on problems of a distinctive Canadian flavour, arises from a concern that the government might establish, as an absolute priority, research into subjects of national interest in pursuit of some national goal. I fear, as a non-nationalistic scientist and citizen, that this sort of decision might cripple the superb research groups which are now at work in Canada. As well, I have what I have always considered a typically Canadian revulsion against parochial and linguistic nationalism.

We have all experienced in our lives, I suspect, the results of government established national goals. In preparing this paper, my attention was drawn to a book by Lawrence Van Der Post called, *Dark Eye in Africa,* and to this passage from it, "Not long, ago, I was in one of the university towns in my country and while I was there the political head of the state came to address the university. He read a long, involved, earnest lecture on how the task of the true university was to serve the state with all its mind and with all its heart. At the finish he received prolonged ecstatic applause which turned my blood cold, for it was a sound I myself had never heard in my own country. The last time I had heard it was at a Hitler rally in Nürenburg. After the applause the young fell into obedient automatic ranks and marched out of sight behind standards bearing portraits of their distinguished visitor over the slogan, "You lead and Youth follows."

We must take care, as the *Report* points out, that the government not become the only force establishing the way to success, and that research funding not be contingent in a project being in line with some national policy. We have already experienced a mission-oriented debauch let's not have a nationalism-oriented disaster. We must insure the continuing availability of funds for research establishments operating at the level of international scientific standard and, as well, arrange for funding of new research which is both of high quality and Canadian interest, generated within the research community. At the moment their may be little of the latter crying for support, but I believe it might develop in the way I have outlined if there is some national commitment to it.

This brings me to an aspect of the *Report* that I find surprising. It has a propensity for overstating cases through bald, unsupported statements and for arguing for support of its goals on narrow utilitarian grounds. The author of the *Report* appears to believe that the only use of an education in science is in some practical application of the knowledge in its specific field or one closely related to it. We don't expect all the students who study history to be historians, or all those who study philosophy to be philosophers. Why should we expect all students who study physics to be physicists? We in science are at least as involved in education as you in the arts.

The *Report* revels in the sort of arguments that are dusted off and paraded for us at each debate on national unity. To quote from the *Report:* "We ought to excell at oceanography, geology, fresh water studies, native mammals and so on". Why? Because of our native habitat. The conclusion implied in the *Report* is that we do not excel in any of these areas. But, the *Report* says, "the interests, practices, and values of scientists are very much influenced by the society in which they live". Does this imply that if we do not have enough Canadian science that the problem lies in a society that supresses interest in things

Canadian? Or should we conclude that a handful of extra experts is sufficient to our needs?

Comments about a 'serious lack of trained personnel' and the need for 'an army of experts to meet this country's need for knowledgeable people in marine sciences' are a cruel joke to our graduates. Some of us have heard all of this before. In the 1950's and 60's we were told of the great need for scientists and engineers. Now our Prime Minister can go to a university in Canada and tell students, if they are looking for jobs, they had better leave Canada. I would certainly agree that Canada needs knowledgeable people, but they are not needed only to fill projected job openings requiring specific expertise. Our concern ought to be the need of this country for people with the ability to understand the significance, or lack of it, of data from various sources on a given subject, to draw conclusions on the basis of these data, and to act from these conclusions. Perhaps what may be considered a non-science example of that, is Justice Berger's *Report*.

The role of education is to sharpen these abilities and I believe that education in the sciences is at least as effective in doing so as education in other areas. The *Report* does disservice by stressing the technical aspects of a science education at the expense of the intellectual discipline that is embodied in it. The *Report* presents a view of the situation in Canada that may be open to question by its presentation of the quantitative aspects of the subjects it discusses. The number of research establishments and research workers must be considered in relation to the total population in Canada. Just to see an adequacy of research funds can be documented in terms of the percent of the gross national product that it represents, so the adequacy or inadequacy of the size of the research community must be assessed in terms of the percentage of population it represents. This assessment might place us in a position to discuss whether we need more research organizations or just different research organizations and research directions.

The *Report* states, for example, that the effect of snow have received *"almost no attention by Canadian universities scientists although the National Research Council has done excellent work in this area"*. It is some five pages later that the *Report* notes a very serious fact of life in Canadian research: government tends to monopolize certain fields.

Some co-operation, as the *Report* recommends, between governments and universities in the use of facilities would be welcomed. It might prove useful and economical for institutions such as the Canadian Inland Waters Laboratory at Burlington, to provide a venue for graduate students from the University of Toronto or Waterloo, or the other universities in the area, to study problems associated with fresh water. It seems to me this is a viable alternative to the establishing of similar research groups at the individual universities.

To return to the educational aspect of the *Report*, the author is in my view, quite right in urging a higher priority for general science courses. In the same way it would be welcome if the arts faculty could produce one or more inter-disciplinary courses in its field. The science students would benefit from some integration of subjects, rather than from individual courses in introductory sociology or introductory psychology or introductory economics or whatever. It might be especially useful if such a course could cast some light on the inter-relationship among these subjects in a Canadian context. It would be a relief if we could avoid as well not only the jargon which is necessary to a knowledge of the subject matter, but also the 'gobble-de-goop' which accompanies it. Now you can probably supply an example from science, but I would like to know what is 'the social dynamic of Canadian society'. I don't know.

In order to organize and develop these courses, it might be useful if universities would use sabbaticals and leaves of absence to facilitate the rethinking of approaches and the re-tooling of faculty. The chicken-and-the-egg paradox of courses and text books, which is presented in the *Report* is, it seems to me, non-existant. The course comes first and the syllabus grows to a text book. The problems of publishing text books, or the question of whether they should be published or not, are matters that I will not discuss.

In arguing for the integration of Canadian aspects of science and undergraduate courses, I do not propose that these aspects be in terms of historical reference. I agree with the *Report* that Canadian students are, to a large extent, ignorant of the considerable successes of Canadian science. These range from the development of special strains of wheat, to the discovery of insulin, to the design of short take-off and landing aircraft. It seems to me that these are either down-graded or, as in the case of Candu, which is the best nuclear power generator in the world, have become the victims of government bungling which overwhelms the scientific accomplishments.

I support the introduction of science courses of which a major component should be the scientific development in Canada. To recapitulate, I believe the Canadian aspects of science can be integrated into basic and advanced courses in separate disciplines, and that this approach, rather than a proliferation of special new courses, is the appropriate solution to the problem perceived by the *Report*. This should lead to a revitalized interest in research into Canadian problems. One hopes that the granting agencies will take into account this interest, and be prepared to support this research.

# Andrew Wells

It has become more and more clear to me that the impact that science and technology have on social directions and on societal choices, largely in areas not directly connected to the actual science and technology in question, is really misunderstood. It is an influence which we often fail to recognize, but it is clearly an important influence on the directions that society ends up taking.

I was a little concerned, when I first looked through the Symons' *Report*, to discover that there seemed to be a continuation of that confusion. On page 142, the *Report states:*

> *"In preparing this chapter, the Commission met and/or corresponded extensively with representatives of more than 50 scientific associations across Canada. The Commission was also fortunate to receive at first hand, the views of some 500 scientists who participated from coast to coast in its various public related issues, sent briefs, and made informal submissions to the Commission on subjects as widely diverse as circum-polar research and unidentified flying objects."*

The reason I was concerned is that the *Report* didn't seem to recognize the suggestion or the point that I am trying to make; what happens in science, both pure and applied, does have very serious implications and impacts upon the society around it. Simply to go to scientific associations and to receive briefs from scientists would suggest to me that the inter-relationship is not adequately recognized.

It has been said, and many still say it, that science and technology are neutral, that in themselves they have no values attached to them and that they are not a factor in determining government decisions and hence, social decisions. My experience in government and with the Institute of Man and Resources, certainly suggest otherwise. I do agree with those people who have observed that science and technology is somewhat akin to genetic material in that science and technology carry with them the code of the society which has conceived them. That, I think, is an extremely important point.

The Symons' *Report* began to deal with that question on page 142, but apart from that single reference, I think, it has largely ignored the implications of the proposition I am making. On page 142, the report reads: *"The commission believes that it is misleading to suggest that because science is universal, it does not have a national or cultural dimension."* The fact is science is not just a set of laws, and as one writer has pointed out, science is activity which involves people, attitudes, aims and processes. As such it is as much a part of the cultural fabric of a nation as it is a tiller of technology. Scientific law is maybe universal but scientific practice is not. And that is really the point that I want to try to bring out today.

Along this line I think it can be stated that if society exerts no influence over scientific and technological developments, we will find that our societal direction and development is often determined by the science and technology which is unleashed. Primarily I am talking about applied science, the technological application of science, rather than the pure science itself. But if we ignore what I believe to be an important factor, namely the influence that science and technology has on society, it is to our peril. It seems clear that the direction and development which science and technology takes is going to determine the direction and development that our society takes.

Unlike Dr. Palmer, I am not quite as enthusiastic about nuclear power achievements, if that is the correct word, in this country. I think that what has happened in the area of nuclear power is an example of what I have been trying to say. Here is a major achievement in pure science terms, brought about by Canadian effort and Canadian scientists, largely. It began here and we have developed a very sophisticated and very knowledgeable scientific community around the creation of nuclear power. It was started in secrecy and has largely been kept secret throughout its entire process. It has been an extremely difficult technology to break into, in the sense that it is hard for an outsider to gain information about what is happening, about what the effects of nuclear power might be upon Canadian society. This is because a very strong scientific lobby to carry nuclear developments forward convinced the various governments of the day that the scientists involved were the only people capable of developing and utilizing it. The result is that we now have a situation, in the view of a number of people, where there is virtually a nuclear priesthood in this country. We have a lot of Canadian pride tied up in the scientific and technological undertaking which has never been given proper public scrutiny in terms of the effect of that science and that technology upon the Canadian culture, development, and society. I think that is a prime example of what can happen when science and technology are unleashed and unchecked by the society around it.

In the same vein, there seems to me a growing desire on the part of many Canadians to develop what has been called an appropriate technology for Canadians. To date the desire for this kind of technological and scientific development has received very little encouragement from the scientific community, and certainly very little from the Canadian government. One reason is, simply, that virtually all of the research and development money for technology in this area has been devoted to the development of nuclear energy, so once science and technology has taken hold in the sort of ways I have just described, it becomes extremely difficult, it not impossible, to change directions or to turn back and start again, if the society at large would prefer to do so.

We have tended to isolate science and technology from the real world to the point that once it is established, once it is running, once it is underway, it is like a speeding locomotive and there is no superman around to stand in front of it to stop it. I sense the very distinct possibility that that is happening with Arctic pipelines. We have just recently received the Berger *Report*. I don't think I am alone in fearing that the whole thrust of the companies and the technologies involved are so massive that it is going to be extremely difficult to put a halt to these developments. A ten-year moratorium suggested by Berger is now being decried by all the various vested interests.

While suggesting that there has not been sufficient societal influence on the direction of science and technology in this country, I wouldn't want to find ourselves in the position of dictating to those scientists and technologists, telling them what they can or cannot do or study or experiment with, or what they can and cannot teach.

There has not always been the opportunity at an early enough stage to identify the social implications of the directions which science and technology might take, and to bring to bear on such developments the collective will of the society which the science and technology is geared to serve. We have not had an early enough opportunity to participate in a decision of major importance, simply because the technology was put in motion without our knowledge. By the time the Canadian public wanted to comment, it was far too late to bring the matter to a halt.

I think in the absence of such public imputs, science and technology take on a life of their own; they are directed largely by people with narrow interests, and I am not being derogatory here, not only in terms of discipline, but also in a sense of responsibility. These are people who are usually unaware of the impact that their work is having, or is likely to have, on the society around them. I think it is extremely important to recognize these dangers, and to be alert to any action which might be taken in the area of science and technology to insure that there is an adequate integration of the various disciplines along with a full opportunity for intelligent participation of the Canadian public. Intelligent participation is vital in order to determine just how science and technology can work to contribute to Canadian life.

# Discipline By Discipline Reviews of The Symons' Report

R.J. Baker: *Linguistics*
Colin Howell: *History*
Wallace Clement: *Sociology*
Robert Sorfleet: *Literature*
Mel Watkins: *Political Economy / Political Science*
J. Lewis Robinson: *Geography*
James Eayrs: *International Affairs*
Pierre Savard: *French Canadian Studies*
Wallace Lambert: *Psychology*

**Note:** The reports in this section were extemporaneous presentations during which the various speakers explained workshop results to the full Conference in plenary session.

# P. J. Baker:
# *Linguistics*

The emotional commitment to one's native tongue need not be emphasized to a Canadian audience, at least I would not have thought so. Virtually every society in the world has an educational system that requires a lot of study of the native language or languages. I am not here talking about learning a second language, I am talking about knowing something about one's own language, its varieties, its history, its structure, its lexicology and so on.

English Canada, and to a lesser extent, French Canada, until recently, required virtually no study of their own languages. PhD's in English in Canada need know nothing about the structure of their language at all, and normally they don't. It is extremely rare to find one who knows anything about contemporary English, or particularly, his own variety of it.

It is no accident that a very large proportion of the work done on Canadian English has been done by immigrants. When we did the major study of Canadian English two or three years ago, we appointed a Director in each province. In Newfoundland, it was an American. Here in PEI it was me and I am an Englishman who went to UBC. In New Brunswick, it was a Scotsman; in Saskatchewan, an Englishman; and so on. The work was done essentially, by non-Canadians.

This was also true until very recently in Acadian French. It is not so true of Quebec French, but it was certainly true of Acadian French. The study of language and linguistics is an area in which Canada has scholars with international reputations.

Everyone believes that his own subject, his own interest, is important. I suppose as teachers we have to believe that, but I can't think of anywhere in the world where there is such little attention paid to native languages, where it is so widely believed that they are not worth studying. I went to the teacher training institute in Moscow last year and deliberately looked for what they do in English. They require more study of Canadian English than virtually any institution in this country, and they only study two paragraphs.

# Colin Howell: *History*

In our session we tried to come to some assessment of the impact of the Symons' *Report* on History curricula across Canada and discussed whether or not it led, or was likely to lead, to any real innovation in curriculum. We found as we began the discussion, that few if any of the represented institutions had actually taken a position on the *Report*. It was pointed out by one of our members that in Quebec there was very little concern one way or another about the Symons' *Report*. A point was made that the absence of significant represenation from Quebec demonstrates, in some measure, the limitations of the *Report* itself.

There was some feeling as well that the *Report* did little more than to state the obvious, that it merely articulated a developing concern about the place of Canadian studies in the curriculum, a concern that was already apparent to most people within the universities generally.

In a sense, then, we felt that the *Report* did not go far enough in providing effective remedies for the neglect of Canadian studies in our curriculum. In our deliberations we gave some attention to possible activities or innovations which we thought might assist in the objective of knowing ourselves, and in developing an interest in History among high school and university students.

We talked initially about the possibility of developing interdisciplinary programmes in Regional studies and Canadian Studies. Regional studies in particular, I suppose, provide a contact point with the community and allow the university to fulfil its service function more readily than is usually the case in other "area" studies. In that regard, the community itself becomes a laboratory for research. The university can draw upon the resources of the community, for example, the expertise of community leaders.

But to take up a point raised by Stanley Ryerson in an earlier session, the emphasis in the Symons' *Report* upon specificity, particularly, diversity, and uniqueness seems to imply that simply by recognizing our diversity as Canadians, we can somehow transcend that diversity, we can create an identity or establish that pius hope contained in the simplistic and reductionist phrase, "unity and diversity". But all of that, I would submit, is really little more than *platitude* which may, as Professor Ryerson points out, have rather unfortunate and even dangerous consequences.

What is really necessary, it seems to me, in the establishment of a Regional studies programme is to emphasize the legitimacy of local concerns, to emphasize the legitimacy of local institutions. That is true if we are talking about Quebecois, or about Maritimers, or about the Westerners. But to emphasize the legitimacy of local intentions can carry us somewhere beyond what Canada now is, and if that is the case, then so be it.

A second area of concern in our session involved the need to overcome the assumption that history is simply past politics. There was a widespread feeling amongst people in my group, that we needed to spend more time examining social and cultural matters, the history of business, or entrepreneurship, women's studies and the like. There was some concern expressed, I am not sure that it was shared by everybody, that it is also important to recognize that history is part of an unfolding process.

# Wallace Clement:
# *Sociology*

Sociologists are renowned for their inability to agree on anything. Surprisingly, I think, we have managed to strike some consensus on the questions arising from the Symons' *Report* about what is to be done in Sociology. The *Report* itself deals mainly with Sociology on the political level. It presents a kind of inventory of Sociology, and points to the lack of Canadian content, Canadian courses, Canadian research, and of Canadian personnel.

Sociology is obviously the weak link in the Social Sciences, as far as Canadian content is concerned. That is reflected very well in the Symons' *Report*. The *Report* emphasized, however, that francophone Sociology is very much in tune with its community; very much involved politically, socially and culturally with what is going on in Quebec. Indeed, Sociology in Quebec has been part of the social movement that has created recent events there.

In anglophone Canada, there has been a tremendous uneveness in the development of the discipline. There are really only a couple of centres in Sociology that deal with Canadian society, and it is going to be very difficult to change that now that we are in a period in which there will be very little turnover of personnel. This will not sort itself out. The essential political structure of the universities is not such that people will be rotated. They are going to be locked in and this is a significant problem in changing the direction of Canadian Sociology.

Sociologists would disagree with a recommendation of the Symons' *Report* which argues for the development of two centres of anglophone sociology in Canada which would develop a special Canadian focus. Sociologists feel that it would be more important to spread a Canadian approach to Sociology throughout the country, rather than to let it exist in two elite institutions.

In our session, we focussed on an approach to Canadian Sociology, and how Sociology could and should be developed in Canada. In terms of the first aspect, an approach which we need is to create a Canadian Sociology which ties together sets of key institutions: the state, the economy, and labour. We need a holistic approach to Canadian Sociology. In fact, what we concluded was that anglophone Canadian Sociology should model itself, in a large part, on francophone Canadian Sociology. It has taken a total societal approach. To be much more philosophical, it has certainly been involved in political and social movements in their nation. Anglophone Sociology can certainly use a model of the development of Sociology along the francophone lines. We need to do more than talk about things, we have to do something about them.

Secondly, in terms of the content or approach, we acknowledge and recognize the validity of studies of other societies, especially the third world societies, which obviously have had tremendous ramifications for developments within Canada. We want to be able to learn from dependancy theory and to learn from these metropolitan societies in order to apply the theory to Canada, more than in a comparative sense, but to look at the relationship between societies.

Thirdly, I would say that there has been a kind of unintended consequence of the foreign domination of Canadian Sociology. It has left the few people who have attempted to do Canadian Sociology in a void within their discipline, and has forced them to seek out like-minded and interested people in other disciplines, like Canadian Political Economy. I think that is a benefit, an unintended consequence of being dominated.

Finally, what we would like to do, and certainly what we are unable to do in this brief time, is to develop the basis for a distinctive Canadian Social Science. The crutial task before a Canadian Sociology at the moment is to provide a set of paradigms, of questions, of issues and models, with which we can now begin to move out of the youth of Canadian Sociology and make some kind of realistic contribution to Canadian society.

# Robert Sorfleet:
# *Literature*

Our group is a very diverse one. It contains people from all levels of the teaching of literature in Canadian schools and universities. What we did first was to briefly review what the Symons' *Report* said, what its particular recommendations were, and then we analysed how in fact these recommendations were already being put into effect by developments since the Symons' *Report* was written. We looked at such works as the *Bibliography of Canadian Books in Translation* published in 1975 by the HRCC. We briefly looked at a model of curriculum in French Canadian literature which should also provide a model for English Canadian literature. We looked at the Writers' Union *Resource Guide to Canadian Literature,* which was prepared by the Writers' Union collaborating with various high school teachers across the country. We looked at the research of the Association for Canadian and Quebec Literature. This group is assembling a list of research projects in Canadian literature which are currently in process. We also looked at the fact that Carleton University is trying to implement a PhD programme in Canadian literature.

As I said, however, after looking at the present state of affairs, as a diverse group, we found that we had a number of different concerns and a number of common concerns. There was more interest and concern expressed about the public school and community college levels than about the university level. Among the questions that were posed are the following: Should seed money be available to assist the development of printed resources in Canadian studies at the community college level? Should there be increased exposure of library workers to Canadian literature? Should there be, among other things, a stimulation of regional workshops to help us learn how to translate the regional experience into the national experience and should non-print material be used to assist in this regard?

There was also an interest in the motivation of students and faculty members. There was interest in the role of French Canadian literature in translation. We looked at this in some detail, and one of the concerns that was expressed was that French Canadian literature in translation, used in English Canadian literature courses, might divert people from pursuing an interest in French in the original. Opposed to that viewpoint is the opinion that it would encourage interest in French literature in the original language. Further, people expressed the concern that Canadian studies would not truly blossom until more emphasis was placed on Canadian content in the individual disciplines. Related to this is the absence of a workshop on Canadian Studies at this Conference. All the sessions that we had today were focussed on individual disciplines. There was no workshop focused on Canadian Studies as an interdisciplinary pursuit, and this was a matter of some concern to us. Many of our own interests were oriented not just towards Canadian literature, but towards Canadian Studies as a whole, as an interdisciplinary study.

Finally, as a result of this, we felt that there should be a co-ordination of information on curriculum development in interdisciplinary Canadian Studies.

# Mel Watkins:
# *Political Economy/ Political Science*

There was a little problem, at least in my mind, as to what our session was actually about because Political Economy/Political Science, is not a heading that exists in the Symons' *Report*. That may itself be a criticism of the *Report*, or just that Symons appreciates reality. I have been called all kinds of things in my life, but I refuse to be called a Political Scientist. The people at the session were, in fact, Political Scientists. They were authentic Political Scientists, and there were also some Economists present. Just before the end of the session, I spoke with Wally Clement, who has a much more orderly mind than I do. He made a very interesting distinction between two kinds of questions: Canadianization in a literal sense, which is a question of personnel, of courses and of programmes; and secondly, the somewhat more difficult or different problem of the nature of the paradigm, the state of the disciplines. Our comments really fell around those two headings and perhaps we ended up spending less time on the literal question of curricula than we should have.

On the first set of questions, particularly on the question of personnel and citizenship, there was some feeling by a majority of people that this was really the true problem. The Matthews-Steel problem, as it might be called, has in fact been solved. Although other people objected to the view that that was in fact the case. One point that impressed me was a statement that this particular question is much more a university preoccupation than a problem at the community college level. I hope I won't hurt anyone's feelings in my session if I say that my view of our discussion of that problem, and I blame Clement for ever getting us into it, was the level of discussion hadn't moved one iota since 1968, and the only reason it became really topical now is that somebody said that there aren't any jobs. Americans are here to stay, so let's move on and deal with something that, at least in principle, we imagine we could deal with in fact.

Another aspect of the discussion revolved around the questions of interdisciplinary courses and what happens in them. Perhaps the most interesting point made was the fact that the interdisciplinary approach may actually be a means by which we can engage in a more critical analysis of Canadian society. I might make a personal observation here. As an Economist who teaches at the University of Toronto, which is a kind of branch plant of the University of Chicago, you can teach courses, such as the Canadian Economy, in Canadian Studies but you probably can't teach them in the Economics Department itself. That has to do with the rigidities and paradigms themselves, that relates very closely to the second question about the nature of the disciplines.

I think that is a very interesting point to consider. The person who made this point talked about the Canadian Studies approach as permitting us to be more critical and to be more aware – critical in the sense of a critique of our society. What I would add to that is the possibility of more freedom. It compells people to begin to break down the traditional boundaries between the disciplines. Again, I might say that I think that one can't really transcend these disciplines and transcend these paradigms, but people may be prepared to shake loose a little bit from some of the ridigities that exist here.

The salvation lies in Political Economy and its approach that relates to Innis and Creighton down through to Naylor and so on today. One person suggested that on a basis of the statistics in the Fox *Report* on Political Science that something like 20% of the Political Sciences could be classified as working within a Political Economy approach either around the kind of Canadian tradition of metropolis-hinterland, or explicitly within a Marxist class-structure approach. Well, that is certainly a great deal higher than would exist in Economics.

There was some discussion, particularly by people involved in the more serious matters of educational work in the high schools, and the school system in general, about the need to be conscious of who are the learners. Who are the people who are being taught. There were very strong statements about the extent to which the Social Sciences, as taught in the school system, are really teaching myth rather than facts. Ultimately, that reflects on those of us who are teaching at the so-called higher levels as well.

At the end of our sessions we got bogged down in a way that was classically Canadian. We tried to decide, if we teach in Canadian Studies, what is Canada? Is it just some kind of conglomeration of particularisms? What is our conception of Federalism? That came up right at the end and we might have moved towards some resolution of the issue if we had more time. As someone said at the end: *"What is coming out of this session is that we don't know what we want to teach"*.

# J. Lewis Robinson: *Geography*

Our group was to discuss two topics: geography and environmental studies. We did not deal with the second part of that study since most of the group were Geographers. We simply made the comment that environmental studies was generally not well covered in the Symons' *Report* and that as an interdisciplinary study it has the same administrative difficulties that I suspect Canadian studies is having in universities. We did recognize, though, that Geography has played an important part in environmental studies and this is one of the dichotomies and problems of Geography as a discipline. We are both in earth science and in social science. To some people we are only an earth science, and to others we are only a social science. But certainly to the geographers who are concerned with earth science, earth science is very close to environmental studies.

We spent most of our time therefore with geography in the Symons' *Report*. We were quite concerned about the inaccurate and poor statements about geography in the *Report*. We were dealt with badly. I suspect that part of the fault is our own, in that we probably didn't do as good a job of giving information to the Symons Commission in terms of a brief. We probably also didn't present briefs at the various universities. As a discipline we are at fault and there is reason for that which we will come to in a minute.

It is sufficient to say here that as a group we were concerned that the image of geography in the Symons' *Report* is not an accurate one. Geography is not as neglected in Canadian universities as the *Report* suggests. It is taught in 44 Canadian universities; that is hardly neglect. Every university in Canada, but two, is teaching geography of Canada courses. They didn't understand the formation of geography in the universities because, apparently, they did not count courses called Historical Geography of Canada or Canadian Resources. Other such courses, which are actually about Canada and its geography, are called Urban Geography or Economic Geography. In fact in Canada, as we know in the discipline, most of those examples are Canadian and we are doing that job.

What I am concerned about is that as a discipline we have just finished a report on the status of geography of Canada in courses and in other things related to Canadian studies. In it we came to the conclusion that we were in fact doing our job well and properly. Then the Symons' *Report* came out and said just the opposite. So I think that one of my tasks here is to record the fact that I think you should not read the Symons' *Report* as a statement of the status of geography in Canada.

I did a history of Canadian geography ten years ago. My criticism of Canadian geography then was that we were inward looking. It was about time that Canadian geographers became concerned with other parts of the world. This is still one of our problems. Symons criticized the lack of interest and research in Canadian geography by geographers, whereas if you look at our publications, at our meetings, at our theses, at our research grants, they are almost entirely Canadian in content. That was one of the messages I would like to get to you and to others, that in fact we do feel that Canadian geography is looking at Canada very well.

The exception is the Maritimes and Symons commented on this. He used the Maritimes as *"the example of the neglect of Geography in Canada"*. In fact it is the exception. I didn't realize until just this morning, when I heard the comment that Mr. Symons has spent twenty years here in PEI and in the Maritimes, that obviously he has been greatly influenced by the quite serious neglect of geography in the Maritime provinces. This is quite valid and I am sorry that Professor Baker has left now because certainly one of our very serious recommendations is that they start geography at the University of PEI. Geography is needed in several of the Martime universities and has been seriously neglected.

Our final comment was just to question what is the function of geography and Canadian studies at this meeting. There are very few geographers here. That is partially because I am not sure what this meeting, and what this organization, has to offer to Canadian geographers. We go to our own meetings and talk about Canada and work on Canada. We don't need to come here to talk about Canada. We can do it elsewhere and my concern is that geography should be here and more geographers should be here because I do think that we have something to contribute to Canadian studies. An awful lot of geography being taught across Canada has history in it and economics, and politics, and geology. This is one of our problems as geographers but it is also one of our advantages. I suspect a good deal of geography is, in fact, Canadian studies. I would hope that somehow in this organization you could encourage, threaten, or do something to get geographers to take a more active part in the Association for Canadian Studies.

# Paul M. Koroscil: *Geography*

In the past decade, nationalism and self-identity were major questions being raised by some Canadian academics and the public at large. The concern by the academic community prompted the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada in 1970 to consider a proposal to establish a Commission on Canadian Studies. Two years later, the Commission headed by Professor T.H.B. Symons, was given not only a mandate to study and report upon the state of teaching and research in studies related to Canada, but also to inquire into a number of related matters, such as extent of library holdings relevant to Canadian studies.

*While some people felt that the Commission should begin its activities by a ceremonial burning of the American flag on the steps of the Parliament Buildings, others at the other extreme denied the need to give any serious attention at all to the questions that the Commission had been asked to examine.*" However, most academics, and the general public who spoke out on the subject, indicated that the Commission should attempt to search out the information "*rather than conduct an exercise in flag-waving or cultural amnesia.*" Using the concept of self-knowledge as a justification for Canadian studies, Professor Symons released Volumes I and II of *To Know Ourselves* in 1975.

In Volume I under the title *Canadian Content in the University Curriculum*, Professor Symons indicated "*that Geography is an important field for Canadians and one that should be of natural and particular interest to this country given the immensity and diversity of our territory.*" Furthermore, the study of Canadian geography should be given adequate attention in the curriculum of our universities so that our citizens will be able to have a proper understanding of certain major characteristics of their own country.

On the one hand, Professor Symons indicated that the various subfields of geography, such as cartography, historical, recreational and some aspects of physical geography, had made substantial contributions to understanding Canada. On the other hand, he also felt that geography was a neglected discipline and that there was a great need for improvement and expansion of the field as it relates to Canadian studies.

One major criticism offered by Symons was the lack of the number of geography departments in some parts of Canada, and the lack of course instruction dealing with Canada by geography departments. In reply to this criticism, Dr. J.L. Robinson of the University of British Columbia, indicated that this criticism was unjustified. He indicated that there were 44 geography departments in Canada and that there were only two departments, both in Quebec, who were not offering courses on the geography of Canada.

Another major criticism made by Symons related to the fact that more research on Canadian topics should be carried out by geographers. Professor Robinson replied to this criticism by indicating that the national publication. *The Canadian Geographer*, exemplifies the significant amount of research being done by Canadian geographers on Canadian topics.

Rather than discussing the documented factual debate between Professor Robinson and the Commission's report on geography, I would like to offer a suggestion as to why geography and geographers are not playing a *leading* role in the development of Canadian studies at the university level. This suggestion revolves around the basic philosophy that some geographers have about Canadian studies. On the one hand, there are those geographers who believe that if they are teaching a course on the 'Geography of Canada' then they are teaching Canadian studies and there is no need for establishing a separate articulated programme on Canadian studies in an institution of higher learning. These individuals have been trained in the discipline, they operate within the discipline which is part of the traditional established university system and they gain their recognition and rewards for teaching and research within the discipline system.

On the other hand, there are some geographers who view Canadian studies as the study of Canada from an interdisciplinary perspective. In other words, two or more disciplines interact in the study of Canada. Interdisciplinary relationships have been and are presently a genuine concern beyond the fashions of academic communication at the cocktail party level. Despite interdisciplinary conferences, large-scale research projects, and interdisciplinary programmes such as Soviet, Latin American and Development studies which have been part of Canadian academia in the past, interdisciplinary studies relating to Canada are a relatively new creature of the Canadian academic scene.

Obviously, interdisciplinary studies have happened in our academic institutions and from a Canadian studies point of view, we are living in a time in Canada where increasing interdisciplinary contact and concern for possible solutions to Canadian problems, for example pipe line construction, is a fact of life whether we like it or not.

In dealing with interdisciplinary studies, particularly in the social sciences, one of the major problems to overcome relates to the questions of *why* interdisciplinary efforts have come into existence and *why* they are a necessity for the development of each of the various disciplines, and not a matter of preference. From a social science point of view, interdisciplinary studies have come into existence because the various disciplines do not have totally set boundaries. Furthermore, it is impossible for an individual to know all the vast accumulation of findings, the research techniques and the formulations on even a single problem area across the social sciences. Since very few academic gods with a large 'G' are born, the major problem becomes one of learning and knowing where, what, and how to borrow from other disciplines. If insightful borrowing does occur, the methods and findings of two or more disciplines working on related problem areas can serve as a check on the validity of generalizations, to the advantage of each discipline involved. If the major problem is viewed in this way, the *why* questions of existence and necessity may be resolved. But, in reality the final step in resolving the major problem depends on the level of tolerance of the academics from their respective disciplines participating in interdisciplinary programmes. *If the academics entrusted with the conduct of interdisciplinary studies do not achieve a sufficient level of tolerance, the programme will fail.*

The development of a level of tolerance by an individual from a discipline begins when that individual accepts the fact that there are interdisciplinary relationships. Once this fact is acknowledged, the level of tolerance that the individual reaches depends upon that individual's assessment of approaches offered by other disciplines seeking solutions to a particular problem.

Thus, there is a philosophical dichotomy amongst geographers concerning Canadian studies and this dichotomy has affected the role that geographers have played in Canadian studies programmes. From my own point of view, I feel that geographers can participate effectively in both academic areas simply because of the nature of the discipline, *which can stand on its own merits* but it *can also lend itself to interdisciplinary relationships*. In this latter case, some sub-fields of the discipline have worked very closely not only with disciplines in the social sciences but also in the physical sciences. In the former case there has been a strong interrelationship between urban geography with such disciplines as sociology, psychology, political science and planning in an attempt to understand the urbanization process and all of its associated problems. With the same intent but from a different perpective, historical geographers and urban histories have combined efforts to understand past urban environments. In this case from a Canadian perspective, the Canadian Historical Association in 1977 sponsored a very successful conference at the University of Guelph on Canada's Urban Past. At that conference, 64 historians, 36 geographers and 14 planners and architects were among the programme participants.

Equally important as the urbanization question in Canada is the quest for resource development and with all of its ramifictions on the physical and human landscape. In this regard the Berger *Report* stands out as an excellent example of interdisciplinary co-operation between geography and all of the other social and physical sciences.

From an intellectual point of view, Harold Innis was probably one of Canada's leading interdisciplinary scholars. During his lifetime, he had a greater reputation abroad than he did in Canada. Since his death his stature has risen in Canada, which is usually the Canadian way, and this year Simon Fraser University hosted a successful symposium on Innis's work which brought together geographers, sociologists, historians, political scientists, Communications experts and economists.

The point that I am attempting to convey is that the discipline and some Geographers are noticeable in their participation and contribution to interdisciplinary work.

Geography also makes a contribution to Canadian studies in an interdisciplinary perspective in Environmental, Ethnic and Northern Studies. But again, the problem here is that only a few physical, economic, historical and cultural geographers provide their academic expertise.

Apart from University curriculums, geography and geographers have participated and made contributions to research carried out by various departments at the Provincial and Federal levels of government.

In summary, I believe that geography and more geographers should establish a greater presence, to lead rather than be asked to co-operate, and that they should attempt to make a much more significant contribution to such an interdisciplinary venture as Canadian studies. However, I am rather pessimistic about geography and geographers expanding their interests in Canadian studies in the future because of the economic restraints that will strike most Canadian universities. When such a situation prevails, Canadian studies will be one of the first programmes to be cut. But on the brighter side, the one place that Canadian studies will survive as an academic area of study will be in other foreign countries.

# James Eayrs:
# *International Affairs*

Our session was primarily composed of a group of doers and practitioners. We had a filmmaker, a cabinet minister, Federal government officials, educational theorists, curriculum specialists, and even a couple of teachers. The discussion was vigorous, vibrant and brilliant, but I can't begin to synthesize the widely differing personal experiences and attitudes which, in their clashes and their divisions, illustrate the present condition of the study of international politics. It is a discipline in total disarray, but I won't go into that now.

We began in confusion, we ended in confusion, but it was at the highest level of confusion. In place of a summary I want to put forward, with genuine diffidence, a framework of the ways in which international affairs and Canadian studies, which at first glance seemed like a contradiction in terms, even a paradox, mesh and inter-connect. I was interested to see that the Symons' *Report,* the gospel according to Saint Thomas, identifies only two of the ways in which Canadian studies and International Relations come together. It mentions the study of Canada's international affairs, that is to say the study of Canadian foreign policy. And it mentions the study of international politics from a Canadian point of view, but I would add three more categories to that: the contribution which Canadian scholars ought to be making to the study of the International Relations of Canada, foreign policy of Canada as an object of study by non-Canadians, and finally the international relations of Canadian provinces and regions and even municipalities.

It may come as a surprise to you to learn that a Canadian municipality can have a foreign policy of its own. I can speak with some almost direct authority on that question, because my wife is a member of the Metropolitan Toronto Council and this winter she voted to send the street cleaning apparatus of Toronto to help Buffalonians dig out of their snowstorm. I remember her praying with considerable furvour that there would not be a blizzard in their absence.

Now if I can address myself very briefly to each of these categories and say something about the state of the art of Canadian studies in relation to them. I think the Symons' *Report* bleaps altogether too much in the study of Canadian foreign policy as it does in the study of geography in Canadian universities. I mean, I can't keep up with the literature in Canadian foreign policy and that's what I am paid to do. The Symons' *Report,* after having degraded the condition of the study of Canadian foreign policy, goes on to say that 6,000 books, pamphlets, articles and dissertations dealing with Canadian foreign relations were published between 1954 and 1970 and, I think that since 1970, another

6,000 have been trundled out. But the study of International Relations viewed from a Canadian standpoint does present, I think, a serious deficiency in that, as noted in the *Report,* there is not today a single text book on international politics that is written, not necessarily by a Canadian, though that might be a help, but with Canadians primarily in mind.

Is it a good thing or a bad thing? Or does it matter to have Americans look over and write about Canadian institutions? Well, sometimes I think it is a very good thing. It depends on the quality of their work. I think of an American, Roger Swanson, who has done more to tell us about ourselves when it comes to knowledge about the machinery of conducting Canadian foreign policy than any Canadian I can think of.

There is the question of the contribution that Canadian scholars ought to be making to the study of International Relations generally, and here I can report to you that to my knowledge, and I speak only now of the contribution being made by people writing in English, that their number can be counted on the fingers of a severely mutilated hand.

# Pierre Savard:
# *French Canadian Studies*

We had a lively and very peaceful session. We had many questions to raise. We raised some of them and we answered very few of them. First, there was a general consensus that French Canadian studies were not an endangered species. French Canadian studies are flourishing, especially in Quebec. But we have to distinguish between French Canadian studies being taught to French Canadians in Quebec and French Canadian studies being taught outside Quebec and also the new field of French Canadian studies being taught outside of Canada. We dealt mostly, I would say almost entirely, with the first group.

I disagree with someone who said that there was no interdisciplinary session at the Conference. We had one. We dealt with the different disciplines, beginning with history, because history is the most popular discipline in Quebec. Presently, at the university level, there are many historians. In spite of some problems, we think that history is the most solid discipline now in French Canadian studies.

Since the 1960's, literature has been widely taught at the university level. Before there was a lot of French literature taught from France, but now French Canadian literature is so popular among the students and teachers that there is a problem. There is not enough French literature from outside of Quebec being taught, and some are worried about that.

We also talked about the study of French Canadian language, a very interesting field, and we had a few remarks on the study of fine arts and folklore. We didn't have time to talk about what I would have called the "geography" of French Canadian studies in and outside of Quebec. At the end, we raised two problems, first the lack of co-ordintion between Teachers' Colleges and the high schools as far as the problem of curriculum. Secondly, the problem of French Canadian studies being taught at the high school level or university level by English-speaking academics.

# Wallace Lambert:
# *Psychology*

In the Psychology session the possible role that the discipline might play if it were ever integrated into the programmes of Canadian studies was examined. In this light, the dimension of Psychology that concentrates on the neurophysiological did not offer any unique Canadian explanation. Whereas the dimension of soft Psychology that links up with Anthropology and Sociology would probably be more applicable to a Canadian studies programme. The discussion revolved around this latter dimension.

One question that was examined related to the popular belief that there is some link, let us say, between culture and personality, or culture and comportment, that is unique to a people. Here we are probing with the question about personal identity and what it is to be Canadian. When one looks at this from a social-psychological perspective, one runs through to the possible conclusion that presumed differences between groups along a model personality difference usually are not found. That is, it is very difficult to find a contrast between Group X and Group Y, if one is to put it to a behaviourial test. Thus at the comportment level, looking at model personality differences from group to group, one wonders whether it would be valuable to look through what is meant by culture via the perspectives of the social-psychologist. However, we ended up feeling that it might be profitable to do so, even though it might disturb some beliefs that we do have something uniquely Canadian, ~~or~~ French Canadian, or English Canadian.

If one is to look at the relationship between culture and psychology and the possibility that culture does affect thought and, possibly, personality, then the liaison between something like culture and language gets very fascinating. People will fight for language because they may have a feeling that there really isn't much below the thin wrapping of what we call culture. Thus language is worth fighting for because there is a palpable difference between language A and language B. As you probe in this area you will find that there is more variance within group X than there are differences between group X and group Y. Thus model personality differences usually don't turn up but their variance within groups is fascinating. Now this ends up at a very interesting conclusion.

Perhaps to introduce this perspective in Canadian studies would have a salutory effect in the long run, although it is disruptive in that people would begin to see the commonalities, the similarities, that link man together through time and space. The problem is that the perceptions that people have are that people do differ, that Frenchmen are different than Germans, that French Canadians are different from English Canadians and that Ukranians or even

Americans are different from us. Last year I heard Mr. B. Epp, Director of Alliance Francaise give a talk in Montreal. In his presentation he discussed the state of French in the world and in the last half-hour of his presentation he talked about French Canada, and the French in Canada. With a group of three or four hundred people, who mainly were French Canadians, he made the statement: *"As I come to Canada and I love Canada, I have been here often . . ."* and so on. He wasn't naive with regard to his visit here, he said, *"I am impressed with this as an American nation and I look at French Canada as America and the corner of America that happens to speak French".* He wasn't challenged on that by the French Canadians in the audience. I talked to him afterwards and he said,: *"I am never challenged on that".*

Thus, maybe below culture we get to what it is to be American, what it is to be Canadian. Regardless of what the facts might be, if we look down the tunnel of what culture is, or what language is, and examine the relationship that these have to thought or personality or cultural distinctiveness, the interesting phenomenon is that people think that there are differences there. Now the clash between what people think and the perceptions that people have of ethnic differences is a very interesting area of exploration. I think that Psychology might explore this topic, and the others we discussed, in a Canadian studies programme.